Crown Theological Library

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
* JUL 11 1905 *
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Division BS511
Section .C533
copy 1

CROWN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

VOL. VIII.

CHEYNE'S BIBLE PROBLEMS

Crown Theological Library

WORKS ALREADY PUBLISHED

Vol. I.—BABEL AND BIBLE. By Dr Friedrich Delitzsch, Professor of Assyriology in the University of Berlin. 5s.

Vol. II.—THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST. An Historical and Critical Essay. By Paul Lobstein. 3s.

Vol. III.—MY STRUGGLE FOR LIGHT. Confessions of a Preacher. By R. Wimmer. 3s. 6d.

Vol. IV.—LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY. Its Origin, Nature, and Mission. By Jean Réville. 4s.

Vol. V.—WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY? By Adolf Harnack. 5s.

Vol. VI.—FAITH AND MORALS. By W. Herrmann. 5s.

Vol. VII.—EARLY HEBREW STORY. A Study of the Origin, the Value, and the Historical Background of the Legends of Israel. By John P. Peters, D.D. 5s.

BIBLE PROBLEMS

AND THE

NEW MATERIAL FOR THEIR SOLUTION

A PLEA FOR THOROUGHNESS OF INVESTIGATION
ADDRESSED TO CHURCHMEN AND SCHOLARS

BY

T. K. CHEYNE, D.Litt., D.D.

FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY,
ORIEL PROFESSOR OF INTERPRETATION IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,
AND CANON OF ROCHESTER

NEW YORK: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
LONDON: WILLIAMS AND NORGATE
1904

PREFACE

THE present Volume is an expansion, with elucidatory notes, of the Lecture which I delivered before the Churchmen's Union, at the Church House, on June 16, 1904. It was addressed to Churchmen who took an intelligent interest in the Bible, and wished to know how critical Bible-study was affected by recently discovered facts, but for that very reason it also appealed in a secondary degree to special scholars. For there are notoriously at the present time great differences among scholars, caused by a difference of mental attitude towards new facts. This work is partly an exposition of the new facts, partly a plea for a bolder style of Biblical criticism, justified and invited by those facts.

It may possibly be called a specimen of advanced criticism, but it is not as such that I offer it, for my only object has been to make it as thorough as the occasion allowed. If in order to be thorough I have sometimes been compelled to go beyond my fellow-scholars, such unsought originality may perhaps be pardoned.

Some of the subjects here treated of are closely related to the Christian faith. They have been taken up under a strong but animating sense of responsibility. It will at least be recognized that their tendency is not subversive, but, in so far as the affirmations of the general Christian consciousness are concerned, conservative. Should any one of those whose gift is that of steering the Church find time to look into this book, I would venture to suggest that the part which it most concerns him to test is the account given of these affirmations, because they seem to determine the sense in which ordinary thoughtful Churchmen use certain statements of the Apostles'

Creed. On the other hand, students of the history of our religion will, I hope, take a special interest in the view given of the origin of the forms in which those affirmations are expressed in the Creed. It is hoped that fresh light may have been thrown on the true meaning of the Biblical passages on which these forms of statement are based. Should this be the case, it will be largely due to Professor Gunkel's researches, as summarized in the recent tractate mentioned below. At the same time, it will be clear to the intelligent reader that I have preserved my own independence of judgment even while I learn from him; and I may say once more that on the line which Professors Gunkel and Zimmern have taken as mythologists, I have been to some extent their predecessor and fellow-worker.

In the above I have referred especially to Part II. of the Lecture. In Part IV. I have devoted myself to new facts bearing on the Old Testament. I trust that no one will

accuse me of assuming as proved what is still *sub judice*. I have endeavoured to distinguish between facts, which may be ignored, but cannot be argued away, and the inferences which follow from those facts. At the same time, no one, I hope, will blame me for holding that some of my inferences are too well-founded to be safely denied. Some other facts, for which further evidence is still to be desired, are given in one of the appended Notes.

I have no wish to enter into any of the current theological controversies. In delivering this Lecture, and in expanding it for the press, I have felt myself in a world where "beyond these voices there is peace." But I may perhaps express the hope that the tone, and, in one important respect, the method, of this book may make it useful as a corrective to Mr Mallock's ably written but controversial, and, as I think, in its main conclusions, misleading article, "Free Thought in the Church," *Nineteenth Century and After*, September 1904, pp. 386–401.

To facilitate study I have prefixed a Summary of the Contents of the Lecture, giving those of the first two parts with special fulness. May I add the request that the Notes may be perused by those who are interested in the Bible with not less care than the Lecture?

CHIEF ABBREVIATIONS

Schöpfung. *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit.* Von H. Gunkel. Mit Beiträgen von H. Zimmern. Göttingen, 1895.

Verständniss. *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständniss des Neuen Testaments.* By the same Author. Göttingen, 1903.

K.A.T. *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament.* Von Eberhard Schrader. Dritte Auflage, mit Ausdehnung auf die Apokalypsen, Pseudepigraphen, und das Neue Testament. Neu bearbeitet von Dr H. Zimmern und Dr H. Winckler. Berlin, 1902–1903.

Offenbarung. *Die Offenbarung Johannis* (in Meyer's *Kommentar*). Von Wilhelm Bousset. Göttingen, 1896.

SUMMARY OF THE LECTURE

PART I

The subject of critical Bible-study is large and important, but dangerous. First of all, therefore, we must survey the situation, and fortify students by showing them an ideal of character. The appeal of Huxley in one of his Lay Sermons in 1870 has a lesson for to-day. It was the clergy who opposed science, and the clergy were mistaken. So too afterwards the clergy were opposed to the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament, and the best of the clergy had to confess themselves mistaken. So far, so good. But there was a deficiency in this act of justice. The Higher Criticism of the New Testament was practi-

cally set on one side, and those who sought to do critical work were beset with exhortations to be sober, cautious, moderate, etc., with results most unfavourable to thoroughness in the work.

Evidently the opponents had caught no glimpse of the high ideal of the true historical critic of the Bible. It is important, therefore, to sketch the ideal critic here. It must, however, be admitted, not only that such a critic has not appeared among us, but also that the existing criticism has not aimed high enough. The admission may well inspire sadness, and since all thoughtful Churchmen share the responsibility with the critics themselves, the Lecturer thinks that his own melancholy may be shared by some of his hearers. A High Churchman, however, has provided unconsciously for our case. "Heaven must be won, not dreamed." There is also a voice and a message for us in the circumstances of the hour, which may well rouse us from our depression. For there

is just now a revival of suspicion and denunciation. If criticism is to exist in the Church,—alien though it be to the Church's proper object,—it must at any rate not be free and untrammelled. How shall we answer this? Not by counter-denunciations, but by an appeal to reason. The National Church is large enough to include critics, but if criticism is to exist and prosper, it must be a complete criticism. Why not, indeed? Criticism is one of God's gifts, and, through living in the Church, critics can both give and take much that is precious. The Anglican Church is at once Catholic and Evangelical. Its theological inconsistencies can only be reconciled on the basis of an improved psychology of religion and a free Biblical criticism. Without the latter, at any rate, regarded as the first part of a historical theology, the Church will be unable to re-interpret and re-formulate its doctrines—unable to do what the most thoughtful part of English Christendom imperatively demands of it.

To help to bring this about is the ultimate object of educated, liberal-minded Churchmen. What follows from this? Why, that they may fairly be expected to take note of and encourage more than one solitary type of criticism of the Bible. He who knows only one religion, knows not even that as it ought to be known, and he who knows only one type of Biblical criticism has no vital knowledge even of that. Apart from prejudice, even practical men, if they have any regular leisure time, will find it desirable to read and ponder the works of innovating critics both of the Old and of the New Testament. But it may perhaps be asked, while admitting that the love of truth is not absent from innovating critics, must we not be on our guard against the "wandering lights" that seem to us to beguile them? In answer, it may be said that the probability that any really and fundamentally extreme critics should arise in England or even in Germany is not very great, the power of tradition in

both those countries, though doubtless not in the same degree, being so strong. Thoughtful Churchmen hardly need to be warned against English or even German advanced critics on the ground that those critics are so liable to be led astray by "wandering lights." If there be any English innovators, let us be thankful for them. They must be men who, to all that moderate critics are supposed to possess, superadd an acquaintance with new problems and new methods such as those critics lack. And being such men, must they not protest against being condemned on utterly false grounds by critics who have not taken the trouble to understand them?

We are here concerned mainly with English workers, and we can willingly admit their imperfections. Advanced critics may sometimes go too fast, and moderate critics too slowly. For both, honourable excuses may be given. The Lecturer could not wish any student either to ignore or to oppose such

truly honest men as our moderate critics, but he warns the student that too many of them have set up a new critical dogmatism or orthodoxy which bodes evil. Before he begins the exposition of some of those new facts on which the wider Biblical criticism of the future must be based, he is bound to defend the new critical movement against the hostility of the new Church militant, not however, by retaliation and censorious criticism, but by a friendly suggestion or offer.

This offer is to do all that can be done, with the co-operation of fair-minded moderate scholars, to promote mutual recognition among Bible students in general. The "necessary hostility" decreed by some impetuous persons on the moderate side would, if this offer be accepted, have to be broken off, and the imitation of such partisanship on the part of the more headstrong advanced critics would be precluded. A place of honour would have to be found for all who have done good work from any critical point of view, and such

mutual recognition would extinguish narrowness and conduce to the general progress. Only thus, as it would seem, can the present ominous misunderstandings be removed. Of this offer the hearers or readers of the Lecture are witnesses. They too, not less than the scholars referred to, are concerned with the reception of this proposal, for it is one object of the opponents of the advanced critics to prevent these from exercising any appreciable influence, at any rate by their writings, on English Bible students, at the universities or elsewhere.

PART II

The Lecturer, having done his best to loosen prejudices, now turns to his special theme. Not light-heartedly, for the Anglican Church is more suspicious of research than was the older Latin Church, and also because of his own share of human liability to error. He begins with the New Testament. There are

certain important facts which are still new to most students, or, if not almost new, yet too commonly misunderstood. The Lecturer claims the right to make this criticism, because facts of this order in another part of the field have long been one of his special studies.

This requires a slight digression to the Old Testament. There is not inconsiderable evidence, both in Genesis and elsewhere, of the influence upon the Israelitish mind of an Oriental mythology of Babylonian origin. This evidence exists sometimes in mere phrases, but sometimes also in forms of belief and in detailed narratives. The more important of these clearly show that the higher religious guides of Israel deliberately adopted these imaginative, non-historical, but from the very first deeply significant representations as the repositories of spiritual truths. Conservative theologians will have to admit that the New Testament now has to be studied from the point of view of mythology as well as from that of philological exegesis and church-history.

The similarity of the New Testament to the Old, though not at all complete, is yet quite sufficient to justify and require this. There are no doubt various branches of New Testament study which are beginning to be regenerated, but for that harmonious combination of points of view which is necessary for the due comprehension of the New Testament, it is essential that the help of mythology, treated of course by strictly critical methods, should be invoked. In short, there are parts of the New Testament—in the Gospels, in the Epistles, and in the Apocalypse—which can only be accounted for by the newly-discovered fact of an Oriental syncretism, which began early and continued late. And the leading factor in this is Babylonian.

But is it safe to take this line of criticism? The answer is that if it is safe in the case of the Old Testament—and experience proves that it is—it must also be safe in that of the New. Moreover, even from an apologetic point of view, some new line must be adopted.

For it is probable that the prevalent scepticism partly arises from our insistence on the inseparableness of the form and the spiritual contents of certain very prominent New Testament statements. It is essential that Church-teachers should prepare for a radical change in their methods. The course at present taken is scientifically wrong, and seems inconsistent with a rich and buoyant faith in God and confidence in truth. Liberal Roman Catholics already see this clearly, and the Lecturer quotes the Baron von Hügel, as a prominent representative of their school, to prove this fact. Historical phenomena must be tested by history, but the Church is sure that facts enough will remain for the needs of religion, and historical criticism justifies this assurance.

Among the more peculiar and difficult New Testament statements are those concerning the Virgin-Birth of Jesus Christ, and concerning His descent into Hades, to which, as hardly less difficult to the lay mind, those

respecting His Resurrection and His Ascension may be added. A trained historical and psychological critic can take up such a subject calmly, not from any want of reverence, but because he knows that the question of questions is quite different from that which the "man in the street" and even the controversial essayist suppose, viz., What was there in the personality of Jesus which led early disciples to identify Him with the Christ, the Son of God?

As to the Virgin-Birth. The silence of the Gospels, apart from the Preludes to our Matthew and Luke (the latter of which may not be in its original form), is in itself sufficiently startling. But we must not pause now to discuss this question, for a more interesting one claims our attention. It has often been said that the statement in Matt. i. 18 has a mythological basis. But the theory has been generally offered by men out of sympathy with the Church, and has not hitherto had a sufficiently perfect critical form. Let it be

seen that the myth from which the statement in Matt. i. 18 may, with much plausibility, be considered to be drawn was, in very early times, a repository of spiritual truth, and that it existed among the Jews (as a portion of the popular Messianic doctrine) before it became in certain circles Christianized, and the most important objections of conservative theologians will be met. It is the next object of the Lecturer to show this, leaving questions which arise incidentally—such as the meaning of the "Son of man" in Dan. vii. 13, and the character and original position of Michael—to be considered in the Notes.

Among the stories which may reasonably be regarded as parallel to that of the Virgin-Birth are (1) the N. Arabian myth of Dusares, (2) the strange narrative in the Apocalypse (Rev. xii.) respecting the splendidly attired woman in heaven, and the great red dragon also in heaven, together with all that belongs to this wondrous tale, in its origin so evidently Babylonian. It would be difficult to

exaggerate the importance of this narrative, the details of which are studied, with the necessary condensation, in the Lecture, and in more detail in the Notes, in which also corroborative Assyrio-Babylonian, Egyptian, and Persian illustrations are brought forward, and the Græco-Asiatic myth of Leto is recorded. In the Notes, too, explanations are given of the beautiful story of the Magi, and of the connected narrative of the Massacre of the Innocents. Nor could the Lecturer omit to refer to the reflection in the Mandæan religious literature of the ancient mythic statement that the Redeemer of the world was the child of the goddess Istar, whose place among the Babylonians was not altogether unlike that of the Virgin Mary in the Christian Church, and to the mythic story of the birth of the Babylonian king Sargon of Agadè. But the hearer or reader is not left under the misunderstanding that the view of the birth and early history of the Saviour is practically the same as that of a Redeemer of the

world in Oriental mythology. The borrowed material is treated with much freedom, and the stress laid on the virginity of the Holy Mother is peculiar to the Prelude of the First Gospel, the author of which would doubtless have much disapproved of the title "Virgin" as it was originally understood.

Should anyone still feel dissatisfied, and question whether all this is not simply due to the following of false lights, the Lecturer points to the numerous imaginative stories in the later Jewish literature, and to parallel narratives in the Old Testament itself. Not that the Oriental myth of the Redeemer arose out of the fertile imagination of any individual; it was of primæval origin, and as necessary a growth of early culture as any other of the most ancient beliefs of mankind, in saying which, however, nothing derogatory can be intended to that true Light, whose rays may be discerned in the most unlikely places.

After considering the spiritual truths of which the statement of the Virgin-Birth may

be considered the repository, and to which the assent of the Christian heart is pledged, the Lecturer proceeds to treat in a similar manner the other prominent statements respecting Christ which are difficult to the lay mind. The Descent into Hades is illustrated by the Mandæan story of the Divine Hero who descended into the nether world to fight with the King of Darkness and to liberate the souls of the righteous. Evidently this story is ultimately Babylonian, and closely connected with the primitive dragon-story. Also by the striking and significant Babylonian myth of the Descent of Istar, though here, of course, it is only Istar's dead consort, Tammuz, whom the divine Visitor to the Underworld rescues. Other parallels are also referred to. The difficult passage, 1 Pet. iii. 18 *ff.*, can now be studied more intelligently than before.

It thus becomes possible to explain the Christian belief of the Descent of Christ, and, in connexion with this, the time-reference

in Matthew xii. 40, in a satisfactory manner. Nor can it well be denied that the form of the statement of the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ admits of a similar explanation. The mythic parallels do not need to be stated at such length as in the two former cases. But it is hoped that the conclusion is sufficiently justified. Now too we can perhaps explain more fully the New Testament references to Old Testament passages as predictions of the wonderful circumstances of the appearance, reappearance, and disappearance of the Christ.

Throughout this part of the Lecture it is assumed that the form and spiritual contents of the statements are separable. The form is derived from the pre-Christian Oriental and Jewish tradition, and is fit matter for archæological criticism; the spiritual contents appeal, not to the critic as such, but to spiritual men (whether critics or not), and their mouthpiece is the Church. An attempt is made by the Lecturer to set forth those affirmations of

"spiritual men," *i.e.* of all who are Christians in their inner life, correctly and sympathetically. If either in the explanation of the form, or in the exposition of the spiritual contents, of these statements, any error has been made, the Lecturer counts on the charity of his hearers or readers to correct him, on grounds not less carefully and critically set forth than those here given.

PART III

In this part of the Lecture certain other facts are adduced, bearing on New Testament study. First, the discovery of a form of the text of Matt. i. 16, which must at any rate be very near the original. Next, an indubitable inference from the form in which Eusebius quotes Matt. xxviii. 19. These are facts of the utmost interest to students of the life of Jesus Christ and of Christian doctrine, and have a special importance just now, when Churchmen

are beginning to ask how these great subjects appear in the light of a more thorough and methodical criticism.

PART IV

In this part the Lecturer sets forth the importance of several new problems arising out of new facts (*e.g.* the problem of the kings in Gen. xiv.; Ur of the Chaldees; Babylonian legal influence; the antiquity of the divine name Yahwè, and of the names Hebrew and Israel, also the Gezer of 1 Kings, and the existence of a N. Arabian Muṣri, Kush, and Asshur). To solve such problems we must employ one or both of the two fresh keys to the interpretation of the Old Testament, viz., Assyriology, and an improved textual criticism. New problems and new methods go together, and it is fortunate that in using the latter key undue subjectivity can frequently be restrained by considerations arising out of Winckler's

discovery of a N. Arabian Muṣri and Kush. There are certain Old Testament passages (a conspectus of them is given in the Lecture) in which these N. Arabian lands must necessarily be referred to, unless indeed exegesis is only another name for obstinate adherence to a less probable opinion in spite of new facts. An appeal is made to students to weigh carefully both the facts and the inferences from the facts here brought to their notice, and to devote a little more criticism to the philological and exegetical theories which are now somewhat too hastily being erected into dogmas. Old Testament criticism is not yet an adult science; there is much work yet to be done, and the traditional form of the Hebrew Scriptures needs a more profound and a more methodical treatment. Not only, however, for the sake of these earlier Scriptures, but for that of the records of nascent Christianity, the Lecturer urges a more thorough investigation of the Old Testament. There is no sharp distinction between Jewish and Christian, and

in conclusion it is added that both religions were deeply affected by the syncretistic tendency. The same methods therefore must be applied to both. And yet those who have a keen religious sense know that each religion has its own idiosyncrasy, and it is for sympathetic scholars to make Churchmen understand what this idiosyncrasy is.

BIBLE PROBLEMS

AND THE NEW MATERIAL FOR THEIR SOLUTION

PART I

The subject I have chosen is a large and important one, and if I consulted my own wishes I should plunge at once into the midst of facts. This course, however, would expose me to great risk of being misapprehended. Circumstances have changed so much, and new prejudices are so rapidly acquiring consistence, that an act of the simplest faith and charity may be misunderstood by those who ought to welcome it. It is necessary, therefore, first of all, to survey, briefly but clearly, the present state of Biblical study, and to put forward such an ideal of character

for students as may fortify them against temptations; only by this course can I venture to hope that much of my own trouble on the present occasion will not be taken in vain. And I would ask leave to preface my survey by a reference to a chapter of recent history which seems to contain a useful lesson for to-day.

Imagine yourselves, then, in the year of grace 1870, listening to that great protagonist of science, the late Professor Huxley. It is one of the addresses published in the volume called "Lay Sermons"; the sinewy force of its English, and the earnestness of the speaker, give it permanent value as a record of the time. In it Professor Huxley calls upon his young hearers to refute the charge that the Christianity of the nineteenth century has nothing but abuse for the Priests of Science. It is for the honour of the younger generation that he makes this appeal; Science herself is too great, too transcendental, either to take offence or to need an advocate; and he

quotes that fine passage of Dante,[1] in which, describing the injurious words ignorantly addressed by men to Fortune (for Fortune Huxley would read Science), the poet says:—

> And she it is, on whose devoted head
> Are heaped such vile reproach and calumny
> By those whose praise she rather merited.
>
> But she is blest, and hears not what they say;
> With other primal beings, joyously
> She rolls her sphere, exulting on her way.

Organized religion, as represented by the majority of our clergy, was at that time hostile to science. It was undoubtedly a pure mistake that caused this, and the mistake has had a parallel in still more recent times. Not very long ago, organized religion, through its representatives, appeared to be almost equally hostile to Biblical critics. Controversy darkened the air, and the breach was becoming irreparable, when in the nick of time the

[1] *Inferno,* canto vii., lines 90–95. Huxley gives W. M. Rossetti's translation, which however is too literal to convey Dante's meaning effectively. The above, which is Wright's, at any rate has the merit of translating the ideas.

ablest church-leaders were led to acknowledge, virtually if not expressly, that they had been in the wrong, and that they had misjudged the critics. No longer could they help seeing that in their suspected brethren devoutness and the love of truth were happily matched, and that some critical workers at any rate were as zealous for religion, and in their own way as able to promote it, as themselves. Upon this, the suspicions of the clergy were to a great extent allayed. Injurious words ceased to be spoken, and in many quarters expositions of the chief current results of Old Testament criticism were received with favour or indulgence.

One deficiency, however, there was on the part of the church-leaders. No desire, so far as I know, was expressed for a continuation of the forward movement in Old Testament criticism; and as for New Testament criticism, it was only referred to as a foe to be repelled. In our church-congresses, indeed, we heard from time to time that the Bible had no cause

to dread the keenest scrutiny. But in spite of this, the men engaged in critical work were beset with pointed exhortations to be "sober," "cautious," "moderate," and even "reverent," as if a true Biblical critic, in continual converse with holy men of old, and in constant view of the most marvellous of religious developments, could be anything but reverent. The result has been, not that research has altogether avoided the more delicate problems, but that it has for the most part been diverted to what are considered "safe" departments, such as the analysis of the sources of the Hexateuch, the textual criticism of the New Testament, and the literary problem of the Synoptic Gospels.

To me, I confess, this appears like unfaithfulness to our vocation, and my only comfort is that people are beginning to find out that one at least of the three departments mentioned is by no means "safe." And if even the textual critic of the New Testament cannot be always "sober" and "cautious," still

less can the historical critic accomplish his task with such a slender moral equipment. Reverent he ought to be, but neither "sober" nor "cautious" nor "moderate" fitly describes his character. Perhaps "moderate" is the worst epithet of the three, for it suggests that critical truth is a mean between two extremes. There is indeed a true "moderation," but alas! it is not often seen. To apply Isaiah's words,[1] it is "as the shaking of an olive tree, two or three berries in the top of the uppermost bough, four or five in the outmost fruitful branches thereof."

What, then, is the higher, or rather let me say, the historical critic of the Bible? This is how I at least imagine him. He is not only reverent to the highest human ideal, but eager to throw any fresh light that he can on its forms of expression. He is not easily baffled, but earnest and thorough, and, in the use of his methods, resourceful. If he makes a mistake—for in new fields some errors are

[1] Isaiah xvii. 6, Authorized Version.

inevitable—he acknowledges it. He does not covet the praise of stability and consistency. Stable he is, and consistent he is, but not as "the man in the street" would define those terms. His consistency lies in his constant aim to penetrate further into historical truth.[1] He is aware indeed that some of his historical problems closely touch high spiritual truths, and that for these he may require the help of psychological students of religion. But he also knows that with such aid the most delicate problems of a historical religion can be rendered harmless, and he trusts that at the right time the manifest truth, which will satisfy the modern Christian conscience at all points, will reward faithful seekers.

[1] The meaning of this is that development and progress are inseparable from research; they are indeed part of the idea. It will be no slight step forward if the student thoroughly takes this in. There is perhaps at present not enough sympathy between researchers and students in general. In the future one hopes that this defect may be remedied, and that the advanced student may have more connected guidance in the paths of research.

If anyone here should be of opinion that no such resolute and resourceful critic has yet appeared among us,[1] the implied censure, even if excessive, might not be unwholesome. The present speaker at any rate claims no exemption from rebuke. He longs to be judged himself by a higher standard, and regretfully admits that our criticism of the Bible has not, in all its departments, aimed high enough. He confesses that he feels some pain at what he sees around him, and, feeling the difficulty of dispelling the timidity of his colleagues, is tempted to envy those who have an easier lot.

This human infirmity may perhaps be shared by some in this audience. For though, probably enough, no one here would like to denominate himself a critic, it is certain that

[1] Had Robertson Smith lived, and been able to adapt himself to changed and changing circumstances, it is permissible to believe that he might have been such a critic for our time. I think he would have laughed at the idea of his critical views becoming one day represented as a standard of orthodoxy.

every thoughtful Churchman ought to have a sense of responsibility for the position of criticism. Perhaps the chief reason why most English critics to-day are so backward is,—that the community at large is so unexacting. Those who hope that they are called to be critics give so little, because the public which judges them appears to ask so little. Doubtless they ought not to need an external stimulus; still, they do. And so it may well be that some of those who, though not critics themselves, yet sympathize with critics, and see the danger of the situation and their own responsibility, may be tempted to give way to despondency.

The present speaker asks leave to mention a fine poem in the *Lyra Apostolica* by which he has been helped. It is by Richard Hurrell Froude, that old High Churchman (1803–1836), who died early, and in his lifetime was Newman's closest friend, and it consists of an imaginary colloquy between Old Self and New Self. New Self notices the "downward look

and sadly dreaming eye" of Old Self, as he sits upon a "sea-girt rock"; and asks the cause. Old Self says that he mourns the bygone days of childish simplicity. To this New Self replies,—

> Mourn'st thou, poor soul? and thou would'st yet
> Call back the things which shall not, cannot be?
> Heaven must be won, not dreamed; thy task is set,
> Peace was not made for earth, nor rest for thee.

Let us drink in the spirit of these words. Away with all depressing regrets for the bygone days of ignorance and low ideals! Let it be our happiness to "spend and be spent" in the cause of progress! "Doth not wisdom cry, and understanding put forth her voice," calling upon her friends to awake? For the voice of suspicion and denunciation begins to be heard again on the other side. A more "free" and "untrammelled" inquiry may be demanded by investigators of nature,[1] but the right, the duty, of a truly progressive criticism of the Bible is denied. Apologetic considera-

[1] Sir Michael Foster, *The Nineteenth Century and After*, May 1904.

tions are brought in to limit our freedom. The Fourth Gospel must be the work of the Apostle John, and must be in the main historical, because the inherited orthodoxy requires it. Discrimination between different kinds of narratives in the Gospels is discouraged, because of the inherited, uncritical interpretation of ancient Church formulæ. And though some Churchmen may be more tolerant than others, yet even these would prefer that a keener criticism of the Bible should be left to foreigners. The Church of England, say they, is not to be a laboratory for bold critical experiments, but a practical institution for coping with sin and wickedness.

And so, partly at least, the Church of Christ must everywhere be. Most warmly do I sympathize with those worthy opponents who speak evil of Biblical criticism, but do noble work in saving souls. But I maintain that the national Church is not merely a hospital for the morally sick, but a union of the lovers of a high and comprehensive ideal, and that

our Church will not deserve its position unless it devotes itself to the ideal, not only of goodness but of historical truth. I respectfully entreat leaders of the Church not to hinder our scholars from doing their work thoroughly. Either let there be no criticism at all of the form of holy scriptures and church-formulæ—a fatal mistake, doubtless,—or let it be a genuine, unrestricted, truly complete one. Biblical criticism has been admitted into the Church; let Churchmen recognize it as one of God's gifts, and seek to make the most of it. I admit that criticism has much, very much, to receive,—for its professors have to learn what vital Christianity is from the Christian Church,—but surely it has much, very much, to give, for the more historical insight the Church acquires, the better it will be able to re-interpret its doctrines, and, if need be, to reformulate them. It may be true, as some friend of M. Loisy has said (*Church Quarterly Review*, April 1904), that the twofold character of the

Church of England (at once Catholic and Evangelical) makes it more difficult for its members to adjust the relations of criticism and faith than for Roman Catholics; but that should only make us Anglicans more eager to harmonize those two great theories—the Catholic and the Evangelical—on the basis of an improved psychology of religion and a free Biblical criticism. The Anglican communion would then perhaps have a better chance of recovering lost members and winning new friends. It would then perhaps acquire a fresh right to call itself at once, in a modern sense of the good old words, National, Catholic, and Evangelical.

If nothing less than this is their ultimate object, may not educated Churchmen, both leaders and followers, rightly be asked, not only not to hinder the work of Biblical criticism, but also to take note of and encourage its progress? This means, not merely reading more or less carefully such books as register what is called the average

opinion of scholars—an opinion which represents rather yesterday than to-day, or at least a to-day, which even while we speak is becoming yesterday,—but following with keen curiosity those far-reaching researches which will take a long time yet to bring to their completion. I am not of course suggesting a degree of thoroughness in study impossible for most practical men, nor do I desire any injustice to what is called "moderate" criticism. My contention is that just as all true students of religious history ought to know something of more than one religion, so all true Bible students ought to know something of more than one criticism; but I would add to this the thesis that if moderate criticism demands no slight degree of attention, that criticism which is in the van of progress demands still more, because the task of assimilating it is so difficult. A little knowledge is surely not a dangerous thing, unless we imagine it to be greater than it is, and proceed to set all the rest of the world right

on the strength of it. It is distinctly worth your while to learn from those English and foreign critics who, with due deliberation, question and to some extent reconstruct traditional history. And if you will only put aside what prejudiced critics have said against Winckler or Van Manen, or, to mention a far more sympathetic and finely tempered innovator, Alfred Loisy, you will find that from each in turn you can gather precious instruction, even if you have a personal preference for Kautzsch[1] or Harnack or our own much-respected William Sanday. For of none of the advanced critics to whom I have referred can it prudently or fairly be said, "He does not count."

It is true, as the late Professor Hort—fitly named, I think, with Sanday—so finely remarked, that "an implicit confidence in all

[1] I mention Kautzsch, not merely out of personal regard, but because to my surprise the editor of the *Dictionary of the Bible* has intrusted the article "History of the Religion of Israel" in his extra volume to this valued contributor to the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

truth, a keen sense of its variety, and a deliberate dread of shutting out truth as yet unknown are no security against some of the wandering lights that are apt to beguile a critic." But this in itself wise caution, belongs more strictly to Holland or to Switzerland than to England. If indeed we happen to be thinking of criticism generally, we may appropriately enough address it to ourselves, but we "cribb'd, cabin'd, and confin'd" English scholars can scarcely be held to be in any special need of it. Our own chief danger obviously is, not from "wandering lights," but from a paralysing dread of new truths; and the case of innovation, if (contrary to all probability) such really exists, is not that of scholars starting out on their adventures without acquaintance with the pitfalls around them, and untouched by the moderating influences of ecclesiastical and academical tradition. Not such, most surely, is the case, even if, leaving our own country, you think of Hugo Winckler; for great, far greater than

one might suppose, is the power of the traditions of the scholar's craft in the universities of Germany.[1] But if you have British innovators in your mind, it must be the case of men who have felt all those influences in the political and ecclesiastical atmosphere which make so strongly for compromise—men who have heard every day those cries, "Be sober, be moderate," which resound throughout our own Church, and indeed throughout the Christian communities of our land. And considering how slight is the encouragement to young scholars to leave the beaten track, the presumption is that any such case of innovation is that of men who have a long development behind them,—of men who have tried those methods which the younger scholars extol so much, and found them in-

[1] I have only mentioned Winckler, because he alone of the innovating critics referred to has a post in a German university. Schmiedel, however, though a professor in Switzerland, was trained in Germany, and has a truly German fear of extremes. Van Manen and Loisy would require separate study—a study which would cause me to digress too far from my present theme.

valuable up to a certain point, and then useless and misleading. It will be the case of men who have known all that most "moderate" scholars can have learned, and have given it the fullest trial, of men who have looked before them, and profited by the newer aids, while strictly "moderate" scholars were still afraid to run risks, and to strike out from the shore. It will be the case of those who to-day see such scholars keeping aloof from the hardest problems, or if exceptionally they approach them, arriving at unsatisfactory results, because they are without the necessary new methods, and the experience out of which the discovery of those new methods proceeds. It will be the case of those who are not indeed perfect critics, self-sufficient and infallible, but who are at anyrate qualified to lead, and to cope with difficulties. At the same time, the innovators, if they exist, will be men who decline to be condemned on utterly false grounds by scholars who have not taken the trouble to understand either their principles or

their methods, and who would themselves have to be condemned if the same treatment were measured out to them. For there is no scholar, however able, who could not be, metaphorically, cut to pieces, if like Dante's friend Sigieri [1] he "syllogized invidious truths," and represented a point of view which was not that of his critic.

That the "advanced" critics, both German and English, have their faults, who would dream of denying? But so too have our "moderate" critics, though the public seldom hears of them. And I plead that the real or supposed faults of each (how easy it is to suppose faults!) should be judged considerately, and without controversial bitterness, remembering the many-sidedness of truth. If the "advanced" critics sometimes go too fast, it is because they have to make up for lost time, and for the languor of others, and next—so at least I hope—because they have a strong faith in the power of the Church to adapt herself to

[1] Dante, *Paradiso*, canto x., lines 136–138.

new readings of history, and lastly, because they look forward to a day in which Biblical criticism, though not entirely broken off, will be less insistent in its claims.[1] And if the "moderate" critics go too slowly, it is partly because they value tradition as a starting-point so highly that they think it unsafe to go too far, or at least too fast from it, and partly because, unlike M. Loisy, they consider that strict moderation in criticism is requisite for the welfare of religion. One may be sure that if they cultivate "moderation," it is not merely because of the voices outside which call for it, but because of a warning oracle within their own conscience.

I could not therefore propose to you either to ignore (this would be a sin), or to oppose (this would be a mistake), such truly honest scholars, but I do advise the student not to listen to them when they seek to keep him from reading books which do not please them.

[1] See "An Appeal for a Higher Exegesis," by the present writer, *Expositor*, January 1904.

I believe that their motives are good, but this makes it all the more imperative to warn you that too many of these scholars have become the champions of a new and highly exclusive critical orthodoxy. We do not want a new Church-militant, whose foes are not sin and wickedness, but critical innovation. I wish that I could be the voice, and nothing but the voice, of an effective counter-influence. But for the sake both of a distinctly progressive scholarship and of a more defensible theology, I am bound, not only to be a voice, but to defend the representatives of the new critical movement, whether in England or in Germany, against what has been unwisely called a "necessary hostility." This I propose to do, not by retaliation, but by a friendly suggestion preparatory to my exposition of new facts. It seems to me that I can thus best excuse what some may think the boldness of this Lecture, and also promote better relations between two classes of scholars who cannot be separated without mutual injury.

The suggestion, or rather offer, which I have to make, and for the general character of which I am sure in advance of your support, partakes of the nature of a "self-denying ordinance." It is briefly this. Let there be mutual tolerance and recognition throughout the commonwealth of Bible students. On the one hand let all respect be shown to Biblical scholars of what may be called a liberal-conservative type,—Old Testament men who have absorbed much of the criticism of the last century, but whose aim or instinct is not to go very much in advance of Church opinion, and New Testament men, who assume less than their *confrères* have done of previous criticism, and might sometimes be taken for conservatives, but who are in their own way critics, and undoubtedly desire progress. Let it become a rule that no member of any section of the more advanced school of critics shall decline to receive help from any suggestion of his more conservative brethren which implies accurate information as to the facts,

and does sufficient justice to his point of view.[1] But on the other hand, let there be a place of equal honour for that broader school,[2] whose ideal I endeavoured to sketch not long ago. Let there be no talk on the part of "moderate" scholars in their magazines of having to assume an attitude of opposition to any of these critics, in order to exclude influences adverse, as they think, to their own on the minds of students. And, last not least, must I not ask that in their critical and exegetical writings there should be clear evidence of the recognition of new problems, and of an endeavour to enter into the critical point or points of view of their bolder colleagues? For if this be omitted, whatever the branch of study may be, but more especially in Bible study, there is sure to be a

[1] I hope I may assume that Professor Winckler, free of speech as he is, would not object, if German circumstances required, to adopt this rule.

[2] In this school I should like to include all who are definitely striving towards a broader point of view, even if in some respects they have not shaken off old prejudices.

failure of justice and a check to progress on the part of the adherents of the older and more conservative scholarship.

Should the spirit of this offer (of which this audience is witness) find no comprehension, the prospect which I at least see before us is a gloomy one. Progress is only possible in a society with a free atmosphere, and such an atmosphere will not, in the case supposed, exist in our society. Mutual toleration and recognition, fairness to all those who differ from us, is the only remedy against a deadening chill to progress, and such toleration, fairness, recognition will not be cultivated among us.

But why, I ask, should this climax of misery be reached? Every competent scholar knows that the "sober" criticism of to-day was considered "extravagant" yesterday, and that there are problems enough, both small and great, in Biblical study, the surface of which has at present barely been grazed, or which at best have been very imperfectly solved.

Why refuse any offer of help? Is there anyone who ventures to assert that there is a fundamental difference between the schools of criticism, such as that which exists between mediæval and modern philosophy or science? Surely not. Both schools in all their sections affirm with equal earnestness the continuity of critical progress; and the members of the newer school, however divided in many respects, agree in showing a capacity for opening new problems which science cannot dispense with. If some impetuous persons, in their extravagant addiction to "moderate" criticism, have decreed a partition wall between the schools, cannot those who are truly "sober" critics intervene to oppose this? They cannot venture to decline all responsibility for the present state of things, and I indulge the hope that they may do their utmost to convince their unwise colleagues of the "error of their way."

PART II

My fellow-Churchmen! For the last few minutes I have addressed myself not only to you, but to scholars at a distance, in the hope of removing ominous misunderstandings. I rejoice now to be able to turn to my special theme, but I rejoice with trembling. First, because there is good reason to doubt whether the Anglican Church in general is quite as conscious as the mediæval Church of the West certainly was, of the necessity and innocence of free investigation within its borders; and next, because, however great the pains an investigator may take in dealing with new facts, he is sure to make mistakes. I have, however, endeavoured to show, not for the first time, how deep is my love and

reverence for the Church of Christ; so much, I am sure, will be generally recognized. As for my mistakes, I do not, from my own point of view, think that they can be very dangerous. All is not wrong, and my mistakes will be sedulously corrected, as they may appear. Sympathy, not censoriousness, is desirable in my critics, for as the great mediæval poet says in another context:—

> To stem this sea may no light bark essay,
> Or careless pilot who his toil would spare;
> Since deep the daring prow must cleave its way.[1]

I begin with the New Testament. The facts of which I shall speak have not been discovered by myself, nor shall I always have something original to say concerning them. But, if I am not much mistaken, they are still far too little known and understood. In one case I seem to have a special right to say this, because I have long been occupied with the same class of phenomena in another field.

[1] Dante, *Paradiso*, canto xxiii., lines 67–69 (Wright's translation).

You will pardon me if I make a slight digression in explanation of this.

It appears from certain parts of the Old Testament that various popular Jewish beliefs are closely connected with a widespread Oriental mythology. Winckler has, I grant, exaggerated the amount of evidence for this in the Hebrew Bible. This arises partly from his absorption in an elaborate theory respecting the mythological view of the world current in Babylonia and in the Babylonian sphere of influence, and partly from his insufficient recognition of the redactional and transcriptional changes which the original Hebrew documents have undergone. Still, all deductions made, the Old Testament evidence does appear to be not inconsiderable. The early chapters of Genesis, for instance,[1] contain accounts of the Cosmogony and the

[1] Mr W. H. Mallock, in the *Nineteenth Century*, Sept. 1904, speaks of these chapters as "discredited." Why should myths, or narratives based on myths, be discredited? Myths are very fascinating and instructive things, but need to be approached with imaginative sympathy.

Deluge, which are semi-mythical in form, and ultimately of Babylonian origin. So much, I suppose, apart from the word "semi-mythical," would be universally accepted. But we may quite safely go further, and assert that details of other quasi-historic narratives, as well as prophetical and poetical phrases and forms of belief in the Old Testament, are semi-mythical, and show the direct or indirect influence of Babylonia. In saying this I do not deny the idiosyncrasy of the Jewish religion, nor do I admit the vulgar identification of myth with fable.[1] I only affirm that certain elements in the Israelitish records, though sufficiently[2] fused with the central religious principles, were borrowed from a people of higher antiquity and prestige, and of richer and more luxuriant imagination.

It has been my lot to be one of the pioneers

[1] In defence of the use of the word "myth," see Lobstein, *The Virgin-Birth of Christ* (Crown Theological Library), page 128, top, "Myth, no less than history," etc.

[2] For examples of an incomplete fusion see Gen. vi. 1–4, and Rev. xii. 1.

in the work of proving this. It was not my wish to imply that the Hebraized myths, or semi-myths, were from a religious point of view merely on a level with their Oriental originals. But I certainly did mean that there were points in Oriental religious systems with which the Israelites had some degree of sympathy. For religion being, from the ancient point of view, a part of culture—indeed its very centre and origin—those who were affected by any external culture could not but fall under the influence of the accompanying religion. And though I could not admit that the phrase "symbolic narrative" was a better or truer expression than "myth," I certainly did hold that adapted myths, like those of the Cosmogony and the Deluge, and of Jonah in the "great fish," were the repositories of spiritual truths, which, in an abstract form, could not have been conceived by Jewish minds, much less have commanded general attention.

I will now proceed to say why I hold that

facts of Oriental archæology (including mythology) may hopefully be brought into connexion with the New Testament. My reason is that a careful study reveals in some places considerable similarity between the New Testament and the Old in the nature of their contents. There should at any rate be nothing in this to shock any conservative theologian. It is true, there is much greater variety in the Old Testament than in the New, but the form and substance of much that the Old Testament contains is parallel to that of much that is contained in the New. If this is the case, there is no apparent reason why the criticism of the New Testament should not be brought more into line with that of the Old, and why, in our criticism, we should reject the aid of Oriental archæology. I do not, of course, undervalue the help of advanced textual criticism, the greatest achievements of which, however, are reserved for the future. I also fully admit that discoveries of fragments of Gospels, and of Logia of Jesus, as well as

of other unimagined treasures, must, when critically treated, contribute to the solution of interesting problems. Still, for some of the most delicate and important problems the critic will have to become to a certain extent an archæologist, and even, to speak more precisely, a mythologist. And I submit that the form of the most peculiar and difficult New Testament statements can only be accounted for by the newly-discovered fact of the all-pervading influence of Oriental and more particularly Babylonian and Persian systems of belief.

Here the objector may perhaps ask, "Are you not inviting us to empty the New Testament of its special significance? If you touch the form of a New Testament statement, must you not jeopardize the contents? Are not form and contents, here at least, inseparably united?" I reply that in the case of the Old Testament I have not given such a proof of spiritual dulness as the objector supposes me to be giving in the case of the

New. The significance of the most peculiar and difficult statements in the Old Testament is not impaired, but rather brought into fuller relief, by the exhibition of the semi-mythic character of the form. Why should it be otherwise in the case of the New? Why should it be denied that the form and the essential contents of New Testament statements can be distinguished, through the harmonious co-operation of two classes of critics, one literary and historical, the other philosophical or psychological? It appears to me that scepticism as to the fundamental truths of Christianity partly arises from our having insisted on the inseparableness of the form and the spiritual contents of certain New Testament statements. It was inevitable to insist upon this at the time when our Church formularies were compiled; it is neither necessary nor judicious to do so in our day. May our rulers be guarded from rash action! On this point it may be helpful to Anglicans if I quote the opinion of an earnest liberal

Roman Catholic—the Baron von Hügel—as given in the following passage, though most of us perhaps may use different language as to the relation of "the Church" to Christian experience.

The idea of the Incarnation[1] supposes and contains, on the one hand, a limited series of historical phenomena; on the other, an unlimited reality and power which can be reached and which communicates itself to us across these phenomena. This reality draws our souls to itself, by all that is deepest and most inalienable within us. It is this that our experience of life, aided by grace, seeks and wishes for. Doubtless, the act of faith which unites us to this reality does not apply directly to the phenomena, but in fine it supposes them and makes use of them. Taken in themselves, these historical facts belong to history. It is for the historical methods to control them. As soon as this preliminary work is started, the Church intervenes, and puts us on our guard against all *à priori* rationalism. Here its jurisdiction is only indirect and negative. It recognizes itself the rights and the necessity of a serious critical method, and it interdicts to us equally rationalism or scepticism and "fideism" or superstition in the manipulation of those documents. Let criticism do its work. Upon its completion there will still remain undebateable facts enough for the needs of religion. The

[1] It is time for historical theologians to gird themselves to the task of explaining the outward form of the great belief referred to. How came the words καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (John i. 14) to be written?

Church is sure of this. It is promised to her by her faith, which shows to her in God the unique source of reason and of revelation, of nature and of grace. No ingenuity of apologetics could add anything to that faith,—a faith which hitherto facts have always justified.

In the search for, and the study of, the second of these elements the Church enters directly on the scene, being co-productor and guardian of Christian experience and mistress of truth. There her jurisdiction is positive. There an indefinite amount of growth is positive. There an indefinite amount of growth is possible, though a certain fixity of orientation regulates and controls that growth.[1]

Among the peculiar and difficult New Testament statements to which I have referred are those concerning the virgin-birth of Jesus Christ (Matt. i. 18, cp. *vv.* 23, 25) and concerning His descent into the nether world (Matt. xii. 40, cp. Rom. x. 7, Eph. iv. 8–10, 1 Pet. iii. 18 *ff.* [?], Rev. i. 18). I mention these statements in the first instance because they strike one with a greater sense of strangeness than does the statement that (omitting "the third day," because the time-reference belongs rather to the Descent) Jesus Christ

[1] *Du Christ Éternel et de nos Christologies successives,* par le Baron F. de Huegel. Extrait de *La Quinzaine,* 1er juin 1904.

rose (or was raised) from the dead, or the companion-statement that He ascended into heaven. For these two statements may, provisionally at least, be represented as simple postulates of faith,[1] but it cannot plausibly be regarded as a postulate of unaided faith that the Messiah should be born of a virgin, or that He should descend for three (or for two) days into Sheól. It is plain therefore that at least in these two cases every truth-loving Churchman must admit that a critical examination is liable to no objection from the side of faith. I shall now proceed to act upon this necessary admission, so far as the form of a lecture permits. At the same time I would point out to the student in passing that there is a far greater subject of inquiry than this. What we most keenly wish to know is, not whether the two statements referred to can be accounted for as non-historical or extra-historical, but what peculiarity there was in

[1] Cp. *Lex Orandi*, by George Tyrrell, S.J. (1903), pp. 182 *ff.*, 187 *ff.*

the personality of Jesus of Nazareth which led early disciples to identify Him with the Christ, the Son of God, and by which we too, so long afterwards, are led habitually to call Him "our Lord" and "our Saviour."[1]

This, and nothing but this, stands by itself as the most fascinating critical problem presented by the Gospels. Why did an early Christian writer say, "Every spirit which confesses that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is born of God" (1 John iv. 2)? And again, "Who is he that conquers the world, but he that believes that Jesus is the Son of God?" (1 John v. 5)

It does not, however, enter into my present plan to discuss this high theme. I am concerned just now with the statement of the birth of Jesus of Nazareth from a virgin. This is of course separate from the question as to His birthplace and His family, and as to the reported census of "Cyrenius." The subject

[1] Cp. Lobstein's thrilling statement of the affirmations of the Christian consciousness (*The Virgin-Birth of Christ*, pp. 96–100).

of the Virgin-Birth has a distinctive character of its own, and requires to be taken up again from a special point of view. The testimony to the fact is limited to the preludes to the First and Third Gospels, and we shall find that it is not certain that the testimony of our Luke can be pressed. This limitation is of itself significant; I mean that it justifies the suspicion that the contents, or whatever may be the kernel of the contents, cannot be regarded as certainly historical, while on the other hand it may incline us to attach all the more historical importance (subject to further investigation) to the unquestioned part of those two Gospels. It was a not unreasonable conjecture of continental Baptist theologians in the sixteenth century after Christ that the first two chapters of Matthew and of Luke were later interpolations.[1] The silence of the Gospels apart from

[1] Prof. N. Schmidt, *Ethical Record* (New York), 1904, p. 72. It may be objected that these Baptists were heterodox. But what was Spinoza? And yet who denies that his doubts as to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch were well founded?

these preludes cannot easily be explained away, but it is not my present object to consider what inferences follow. I desire to ascertain whether the statement of the Virgin-Birth cannot be accounted for in a way that shall not shock religious minds with a conservative bias. Perhaps I may also be successful in giving a specimen of the application of the historical method in the study of religious traditions. It is true that in doing this I shall have to become a mythologist, but I hope that my own efforts and those of others have loosened the prejudice of church-students against the much misunderstood and indispensable word "myth." And I can promise that by no careless words of mine shall the wrench which always attends separation from cherished ideas be rendered more painful.

The wrench of which I have spoken may be mitigated if we consider how well the idea of a mythic origin of the statement in question harmonizes with the undeniable central fact,—that long, very long, before the birth of Christ,

the Israelites had come under the influence of highly developed Oriental cultures. If we consider what this necessarily involves, we shall see that this influence must have affected Israelitish religion. In fact, it is no longer possible to doubt that the Israelitish view of the world was partly coloured by portions of an elaborate mythology received from without, and that this accounts for many of those strange representations which we meet with from time to time in the Old Testament writings. It is true, the influence of different currents of culture-influences upon Palestine cannot be traced in an orderly historical manner. But one point at least is certain,—that the influence of Oriental forms of belief, Babylonian, Egyptian, Iranian, was specially strong in what is called, conventionally, the "post-exilic" period. Of course, the religion of Israel reacted against these influences, the dangerousness of which must have been apparent. Consequently the things which were borrowed were more or less completely

Hebraized, and rendered innocuous. This constant pressure of Oriental beliefs on the Israelitish religion is abundantly attested, and its traces are nowhere more visible than in the apocalyptic portions of Daniel, and in the Book of Revelation. Continued study of these monuments of the syncretistic tendency in Judaism from this point of view is urgently needed.

Let me say at once that the historical explanation of the statement of the Virgin-Birth of Christ which seems to me to be the most probable, is that it originated, not in a mistranslation of the Immanuel-prophecy (Isa. vii. 14), which is Prof. Harnack's theory,[1] nor, immediately, in a non-Jewish, heathen story, adopted by Gentile Christians—a story such as those which Mr Hartland in his *Perseus*[2] and Prof.

[1] *History of Dogma* (Theological Translation Library), i. 100, note 1. See Note I., p. 191.

[2] Justin Martyr makes a significant reference to this myth (*Apol.* i. 54, *Dial.* 70). It would lead us too far afield to examine the story. Note, however, that Perseus is both virgin-born and dragon-slayer.

Usener in his *Weihnachtsfest* have collected in abundance (this is Prof. Schmiedel's theory[1]), but in a story of non-Jewish origin current in Jewish circles, and borrowed from them by certain Jewish Christians (this is Prof. Gunkel's view[2]). The second theory mentioned is therefore only wrong in stating that the circles in which the statement of the Virgin-Birth of Jesus Christ was first current were Gentile-Christian. It also appears to me a mistake to institute too wide a search for parallels; a narrower range of comparison may give us clearer results. The parallels that we should most desire to get are—first, Arabian, because of Israel's early connexion with Arabia, and next, Babylonian, Egyptian, and Persian, because almost always Babylon, and in the later period Egypt and Persia also, were most likely to

[1] *Encyclopædia Biblica,* "Mary," i., § 16.

[2] *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständniss des N.T.,* 1903, pp. 68 *f.* Mythologizing conceptions in relation to Jesus Christ were not, Gunkel says, due to the later Gentile Christianity, but were already in existence in Jewish Christianity. Therefore the Jewish body itself must previously have possessed these or analogous conceptions.

have influenced the beliefs of the main body of the Jews.

Parenthetically, I may remark here that the popular Messianic belief was probably much more definite than we might suppose from most of the Jewish religious literature. It received a great impulse from the reference to the Messiah in the Book of Daniel[1] (vii. 13 *f.*), but this reference itself proves that the Messianic belief had already a development behind it. And from the Synoptic Gospels we see that this belief was deeply fixed in the popular mind in the time of Jesus. So much may be stated, with the brevity which our circumstances demand, to illustrate the statement that the account in Matt. i. 18 *ff.* has most probably arisen out of a non-Jewish story, known in certain Jewish circles, and adopted from these by some Jewish Christians.

Among the parallels which come into consideration I will first mention the N. Arabian

[1] See Note iv., p. 213.

mythic story of Dusares,[1] which the heathen Arabs themselves saw to be parallel. Dusares in fact was worshipped, both at Petra and at Elusa, as "the only begotten of the Lord" (μονογενὴς τοῦ Δεσπότου), and his mother as the Virgin (Παρθένος, Κόρη).[2] No doubt he is just such a deity as Tammuz (the Babylonian Dumuzi), who is variously represented as the son and as the husband of Istar.[3] In this connexion it may be noticed that, as Jerome (*Opera*, i. 321) states, the cult of Tammuz or Adonis was practised in the reputed cave of the Nativity at Bethlehem. This father indeed regards the cult as a deliberate profanation, but the question is whether the cave had not, long before the birth of Christ, been connected by popular tradition with Tammuz-worship. The

[1] Dusares = Dhû-sharâ, a local name for Tammuz, alluding perhaps to the beginning of the year in autumn (Winckler, *Arabisch-Semitisch-Orientalisch*, p. 129). Cp. also Winckler, *op. cit.*, pp. 126 *f.*; W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage*, 2nd ed., pp. 298–303; Wellhausen, *Reste des Arabischen Heidenthums*, pp. 48 *f.*

[2] Epiphanius, *Hær.*, li. The goddess is Al-Lat (p. 206).

[3] See *Enc. Biblica*, "Tammuz"; and cp. "Adonis," § 2.

mother of Dusares was the old mother-goddess, and the title "Virgin" applied to her suggests the true meaning of the term in that non-Jewish story which was most probably adapted by Jews and Jewish Christians, as they thought best. Dusares, of course, being a Tammuz figure, is not represented as the world's Redeemer. That privilege was left for the Babylonian Marduk. He is, however, the "only begotten," which may remind us of the "only begotten God" in perhaps the best text of John i. 18.[1]

And what was the original meaning of the term "Virgin"? As has long since been shown, it expressed the fact that the great mythic mother-goddess was independent of the marriage-tie. In those remote times to which the cult of that goddess properly belonged, "the mother held the chief place in the clan, and all women shared a measure of free love."[2]

[1] μονογενὴς θεός is Westcott-Hort's reading; it is supported by Cod. Sin., B, C*, L, Memph., Pesh., Clem. Alex., Origen, Basil. The Revised Version, in margin, renders "God only-begotten."

[2] Barton, *Semitic Origins* (1902), p. 84.

The goddess-mother in fact preceded the goddess-wife. In Egypt, for instance, Isis first of all finds representation as an independent deity; only at a latter stage was she said to be married to Osiris. The student must not be repelled by my reference to these facts, the bearing of which on the statement in Matt. i. 18 will be expounded presently. We must remember that the real presence of a Spirit of Holiness in Israel is best proved by its transformations of the rude and gross conceptions of a primitive age.

We have now to pass on to a mythological narrative which is more important than that Arabian belief, because, when closely studied, it illustrates and explains a larger amount of the Matthæan prelude. It has come down to us in a Hebraized form, but it is still very full of mythological elements, so that we can safely illustrate it by parallels in Babylonian, Egyptian, and Persian beliefs. A Græco-Asiatic parallel has also a claim to be mentioned.

This important but very strange narrative has found insertion in one of the many com-

posite books in the Bible, the Apocalypse of John (see Rev. xii.). Beyond doubt it has a Jewish source, though, as verse 11 shows, it has been worked up by a Christian writer. But the Jewish narrator, or those earlier Jewish informants on whom he may have been dependent, derived it from some non-Jewish source. That source was a very ancient mythological tradition, which had become, so to speak, "international," but may in the last resort probably be traced to Babylonia.[1] That the woman "clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars" was, to the Jewish narrator, the mother of the expected Messiah, is plain.[2] But it is from the kindred mythologies of Babylonia and Egypt that we learn why the woman was so magnificently arrayed. The reason was that, according to the underlying myth, she was the queen of heaven, the

[1] See NOTE II., p. 195.

[2] Cp. *v.* 5 with xix. 15 and Ps. ii. 9 (Psalms of Solomon, xvii. 24), and *v.* 10 with xi. 15 and Ps. ii. 2. See, however, NOTE VI., p. 240.

mother of the sun-god.[1] If there be any doubt of this, it is at once dispelled by the reference in verses 3 and 4 to the deadly foe of the woman and her son—"the great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his head seven diadems," who "stood before the woman, that when she was delivered he might devour her child." This dragon and his doings cannot be explained from Zoroastrian sources.[2]

[1] "Queen of heaven" was one of the chief titles of the goddess Istar, "moonèd Ashtaroth, queen and mother both." Similarly in Roman Catholic phraseology, Regina Cœli means the Virgin Mary; whence Dante's use of "Regina del cielo" and "Donna del cielo," *Paradiso,* xxxi. 100, xxiii. 106, xxxii. 29.

[2] Till Fritz Hommel and Gunkel, critics had usually explained the dragon, or (xx. 2) the serpent, of Revelation from Zoroastrian sources. Plausible as this in some respects may be, the representations of the dragon in Revelation can all be explained from Babylonian mythology, which does not, however, exclude the combination of Zoroastrian influences. On this important point see NOTE III., and on the dragon-myth in general see *Encyclopædia Biblica,* "Creation," "Dragon," "Serpent," and for a well-arranged popular summary of facts A. Smythe-Palmer, *Babylonian Influence on the Bible,* 1897. On Zoroastrianism, see *Encyclopædia Biblica,* "Zoroastrianism," and cp. Moffatt, "Zoroastrianism and Primitive Christianity," *Hibbert Journal,* July 1903, pp. 763 *ff.*; Jan. 1904, pp. 347 *ff.*

He is the monster, so specifically Babylonian, known as Tiâmat (a *feminine* form), who represents primæval chaos, and who ruled the world till the young sun-god Marduk conquered her. According to one form of the myth (alluded to in some Old Testament passage)[1] the dragon had been hurled down by his divine conqueror to the watery abyss; hence in *vv.* 15 and 16 we are told that he cast out of his mouth water as a river, after the woman. For, naturally enough, he persecuted the woman whose child was destined to become his subduer. How the dragon knew this we are not told, but the original myth doubtless stated (cp. NOTE II., p. 205). It is added that the earth helped the woman, and swallowed up the river produced by the dragon; that is, the earth, dreading the destructive flood from the great deep (in Hebrew tĕhōm, akin to Tiâmat, the name of the Babylonian dragon), placed herself—as the

[1] See Am. ix. 3, Ps. xliv. 20, Job. iii. 8 (xli. 10), vii. 12, xli. 1–7, and cp. *Enc. Biblica*, "Dragon," § 5; Gunkel, *Schöpfung*, pp. 86 *f.*

Babylonians would have said—on the side of Tiâmat's conqueror. In reality it is the old story of the conflict between light and darkness, order and disorder, transferred to the latter days, and adapted by spiritualization, and by the removal of the name Marduk, to the wants of faithful Jews.

There are not a few difficulties in Rev. xii., notably the reference to Michael[1] (*vv.* 7–9) as the antagonist and conqueror of the dragon, but into these I cannot now enter. What I have to call your attention to is, that this strange and difficult narrative makes no reference to the Messiah's father. This may be explained by the hypothesis that in the Oriental myth upon which this Jewish narrative is based, the mother alone was mentioned. For the "woman clothed with the sun" evidently represents one of those heaven goddesses (*e.g.*, Istar, Isis, Artemis) who were mothers, but not originally wives,[2]—in short "virgins," in

[1] See Note iv., p. 222.

[2] See Ramsay, *Historical Commentary on the Galatians*,

the sense in which Παρθένος was applied to the great mother-goddess of Asia Minor. It appears probable that in some of the early Jewish versions of the Oriental myth of the Divine Redeemer (which has not, so far as we know as yet, been preserved) the mother of the Holy Child was called a "virgin," for nothing is easier than for divine titles to pass from one religion to another, and for their original meaning to be forgotten. In other versions it is possible that the title adopted was "the Woman," a term which may be directly traceable to Babylonia.[1] For the former title, we

p. 202 (cp. pp. 40 *f.*), and cp. Roscher, *Lex. der Griech.-röm. Mythologie*, ii. 1, col. 364. See also the note in W. R. Smith's *Kinship*, 2nd edition, pp. 298–306, ending with the words, "It is well worth inquiring whether in North Semitic religion also the goddess-mother is not older than the goddess-wife," etc.; and G. A. Barton, *Semitic Origins*, chap. iii.

[1] It has been suggested by Zimmern (*K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., p. 361) that the title, "The Woman," may have come from the name of the consort of the divine Redeemer of the Babylonians, which was Damkina, *i.e.*, "the woman of the depth," the Δαύκη of Damascius. Cp. Gunkel, *Schöpfung*, p. 386. Surely Damkina, like Istar, was not originally bound by the marriage-tie.

can with some confidence refer to the Septuagint rendering of *hā-'almah* in Isa. vii. 14 (ἡ παρθένος, whence the rendering of our version), which I know not how otherwise to explain[1] than as an allusion to a belief current among the translator's contemporaries, and for the latter to Rev. xii. 1 (by implication), and just possibly to a passage in the Book of Enoch (lxix. 29), where the oldest manuscript has, not "Son of man," but "Son of the woman."[2] I may state, however, that I do not myself lay any stress on the second of these titles for the Messiah's mother, and mention it here, in deference to some other scholars.[3]

It must surely be obvious that neither "the virgin" nor "the woman" was a natural title to be invented by the Jews for the Messiah's mother. Both are most easily explained on the mythological theory which I am now expounding. I mean that both titles (if *both* may

[1] See p. 194, Note 1.

[2] An error in the translation may, however, be suspected.

[3] Gunkel and Zimmern.

be accepted) came from one or more versions of an old Babylonian myth of the birth and exploits of the divine Redeemer of the world.

The correctness of this opinion, as regards the title "the virgin," can be rendered still more probable by a slight digression. There is a well-known Jewish-Christian view, found in a fragment of the Gospel according to the Hebrews and elsewhere, that the mother of the Messiah was the Holy Spirit (the Hebrew *rūaḥ*, "spirit," is generally feminine). The passage containing it is, "Even now thy mother the Holy Spirit has seized me by one of my hairs, and has borne me to the great mountain Tabor," which probably refers to a narrative of the Temptation of Jesus Christ.[1] That this view was originally connected with a non-Jewish myth of the birth of the Redeemer from a divine Mother, viz.,

[1] See *Enc. Biblica*, cols. 1896, 4884, also 4966 (where the reference to Tabor is explained). The passage is quoted by Origen; see Nestle, *N.T. Græci Supplementum*, p. 77. Cp. also Wilkinson's interesting letter, *Guardian*, Nov. 2, 1904.

Istar, is suggested by the fact,[1] that by the Mandæans the Holy Spirit is equated with Istra-Libat, *i.e.*, Istar-Dilbat.[2] It is true that, according to the old belief spoken of, the Holy Spirit became united with Jesus of Nazareth at the Baptism. But this must be read in the light of the theory elaborated in Egypt, but altogether Oriental in spirit, that the divine double (called in Egyptian *ka*) infused into a royal infant at his birth awoke to self-consciousness at the moment of his accession to the throne. The myth, out of which that old Jewish-Christian view developed, must have stated that the world's Redeemer (not Jesus Christ) was the child of Istar. It will be remembered that the sacred bird of Istar (Astarte) was the dove, and that in Matt. iii. 16, Mark i. 10, Luke iii. 22, John i. 32, the supernatural form which appeared at Christ's

[1] Mentioned by Zimmern (*op. cit.*, p. 440, note 2) on the authority of Nöldeke.

[2] Dilbat is the Sumerian name for the planet Venus. The connexion of Istar with this planet is primitive. See Zimmern, *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., pp. 424 *f.*

baptism is likened to a dove; also that the view connecting the Divine Sonship with the Baptism is strongly suggested by that form of the text of Luke iii. 22 *b*, which "was read in the Greek Church down to about 300 A.D. and in the Latin West down to 360 A.D.," viz., "and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee."[1]

It is time, however, to pause. I have not indeed completed the critical proof of the mythic character of the statement of the Redeemer's birth, so abundant is the store of material. Not to lay stress on Greek myths,[2] which we do not, strictly speaking, require for the illustration of a Jewish tradition, I may remark that I have by me Assyrio-Babylonian and Egyptian evidence,[3] which seems to deserve more attention than it has yet received. But

[1] Cp. the ecclesiastical use of *νἱοθεσία* for "baptism." The quotation is from Usener, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, col. 3348. See also Usener's illustrations from the history of the sacrament of Baptism (*Weihnachtsfest*, pp. 166 *ff.*).

[2] See Note II., Section D. [3] See Note V., p. 235.

I will confine myself here to mentioning one remarkable traditional story which cannot very well be passed over—that of the Babylonian king Sargon (Sargina) of Agadè, who flourished about 3800 B.C.[1] It is a legend of mythic origin, and represents the great king as having been born of a poor mother in secret, and as not knowing his father.[2] There is reason to suspect that something similar was originally said by the Israelites of Moses,[3] and would it be strange if a similar account were given of the birth of Jesus Christ, the second Moses?

[1] It has come down to us in a copy dating from the eighth century B.C.

[2] See R. W. Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, i. 362; Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, ii. 91; and cp. *Enc. Biblica*, col. 3207. We may illustrate the above by the legendary statement in the Westcar Papyrus that the first three kings of the fifth Egyptian dynasty were children born to Ra (the sun-god) by the wife of a priest (Maspero, *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 258, note 4). Stories of this sort naturally arose in the case of usurpers. Thus Alexander the Great was represented as having been born to the god Ammon (Ra), *i.e.*, without a human father (Trogus, in Justin, *Hist.*, xi. 11; cp. N. Schmidt, *Enc. Biblica*, col. 4693). See NOTE II., end.

[3] See *Encyclopædia Biblica*, "Moses," § 3, with note 4.

I trust that I shall not be misinterpreted. This is only a conjecture, but both science and history constantly need the help of conjecture, and this conjecture is a very plausible and illuminative one. For, thanks to the acuteness and thoroughness of Gunkel, it is now incontrovertible that reflections of mythology lasted to a very late period among the Jews. Rendel Harris, too, has shown that fragments of myths were in circulation in many strange disguises in the early Christian centuries, and I too could easily lead my hearers into fields which would supply some important analogies for the view which is here proposed. But this appears to me a case in which one may say that "half is more than the whole."

Still, there is one other statement in the Matthæan prelude which I must, however briefly, mention, and endeavour to explain. In the original myth of the World-redeemer's birth a place was doubtless given to the persecution of His mother by the dragon. No practised eye can fail to see that this has

its counterpart in Matt. ii. The infuriated dragon becomes the angry Herod, whose popular reputation for cruelty marked him out as a fit historical representative of the bloodthirsty monster of chaos. Instead of flying into the wilderness (Rev. xii. 14), the holy Mother of Christ flees with her Child, under the conduct of Joseph, to Egypt.[1] The time, too, is different (probably) from that in the original myth, which must surely have said that the woman fled to a safe place appointed by the Deity, that she might be delivered. In Rev. xii. 4 the dragon is in fact represented as persecuting the woman before the birth of her child, though the flight into the wilderness (of which two accounts are given, *v.* 6 and *v.* 14) is placed

[1] The application of Hos. xi. 1 *b* to the sojourn of the Holy Family in Egypt is extremely difficult. The real reason for the substitution of Egypt for "the wilderness" probably is that Egypt, according to several Old Testament passages, was chosen as a place of refuge, or of temporary sojourn, by several of the personages of sacred history. (The original meaning of the word read as Mizraim, "Egypt," in those passages need not be considered.)

after the birth. Of course, in the earliest form of the myth a flight into the wilderness could not have found place; for the phenomena must have been all heavenly. Indeed, even in Rev. xii. the story begins with the statement, "There appeared a great sign in heaven."

Let me hasten to add that, though the prelude to the First Gospel does appear to contain mythic elements, it is equally clear that the Christians, even more than their Jewish predecessors, treated the borrowed material very freely, in the spirit of those words of St Paul, "all things are yours." The woman arrayed with the sun—a representation still preserved in the Jewish-Christian apocalyptic passage—became to the writer in the Matthæan prelude a lowly Jewish maiden;[1] the functions of her son became, not the destruction of the chaos-monster, nor the ruling of nations with a rod of iron, but the internal as well as external salvation of his people; the

[1] See Note vi., p. 240.

royal capital of the Redeemer became, not Babylon, but Jerusalem; the dragon, with jaws wide open to devour, became Herod, "seeking the young child" in Bethlehem "to destroy him"; the flight of the mother into the wilderness (the child had been caught up to God's throne) became the flight of the Holy Family into Egypt. The stress laid on the virginity (in the ordinary sense of the word) of the holy mother is peculiar to the evangelist. It arose out of a misunderstood title which originally implied something very far from the thoughts of Christians, and the narrative, to a historic and therefore reverent mind, is by no means disparaged if taken to stand in some connexion with the Egyptian theory of the divine generation of kings (see NOTE III. B), and the Philonian belief in the divine generation of certain favoured personages of the Old Testament.[1] Nor

[1] Philo, *De Cherubim*, § 13 (i. 180 *f.*), referred to by Conybeare, and also by Usener, *Enc. Biblica*, "Nativity," § 17. See also Abbott, *Enc. Biblica*, "Gospels," § 21, who gives other apposite quotations from Philo.

must we forget one of the most important distinctions of the Gospel story, viz., that while, in the imperfectly Hebraized story in Rev. xii., the birth of the Redeemer (not "made like unto us in all things") is in heaven, in the Christian narrative the scene of the event is transferred to a humble resting-place on earth.

This view of the ultimate origin of the Matthæan narrative should take away all pain from the discovery that the statement of the Virgin-Birth is isolated even in the Gospel where it occurs, and that it receives no support, direct or indirect, from any other passage in the New Testament except Luke i. 34, 35, which is most probably a later insertion.[1] There is nothing surprising in this. It is obvious that there was no compulsory uniformity of belief and expression in the early Church. Different writers had different didactic objects and different habits of mind, and wrote in the simplicity of their hearts,

[1] See Note vii., p. 244.

without any suspicion that they were contributing to the formation of an authoritative church-document.

To sum up. The mythological theory, rightly understood, removes the huge difficulties which beset the statements in the Matthæan prelude on the assumption that they are historical. The statement in Matt. i. 18, and the passage introduced by it, together with the episode of the persecution in Matt. ii. 13–21,[1] are shown by the foregoing facts to be not history in the modern sense of that word, but rather a substitute for history addressed to the pious imagination. Some persons may find it difficult at first to realize this. It becomes their duty, therefore, to acquaint themselves with some of the numerous imaginative narratives in the later Jewish literature, and also with the striking specimens of this kind of composition in the Old Testament writings. The Book of Genesis, as all

[1] On the story of the Magi in Matt. ii. 1–12, see Note viii., p. 245.

recent critics agree, abounds in passages which, though seemingly historical, are really legends,[1] and sometimes even contain elements of non-Jewish mythic origin. So far as the virginity of the Mother of Christ is concerned —I speak as a historical critic—the passage in the prelude to the First Gospel is a Jewish-Christian transformation of a primitive story, derived ultimately, in all probability, from Babylonia, and analogous to the Jewish transformation of the Babylonian cosmogony in the opening section of Genesis. That primitive story has evidently passed through a succession of phases—1. concurrent Oriental phases, one cannot exactly tell how many, 2. a Jewish phase, 3. a Jewish-Christian. This is the view, which in my opinion is historically most acceptable, having regard

[1] See H. Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis* (Chicago, U.S.A.). In a less brilliant style, and seemingly with a less clear view of the nature of legends, Prof. Driver treats the same subject in an instructive and scrupulously moderate work, *The Book of Genesis* (Westminster Commentaries, edited by Dr Walter Lock), 1904, Introduction, § 3.

both to the far-reaching influence of Babylonia, and to the well-known habits of Jewish editors.

Is there any irreverence in this view? Such a supposition can only be excused by ignorance of the temper of historical critics. Reverence is a fundamental requirement in the historical student of religion. How indeed should we understand any of the utterances of faith without reverence? Even to the old Babylonian and Egyptian myths referred to above, we owe this tribute, for they express one of the most ancient longings of the human heart, that for a Redeemer from evil. And if the devout Egyptological student, Victor Ancessi, goes too far when he transfers the most essential Catholic-Christian ideas into a remote antiquity, yet we cannot deny that at least the germs of some, or even many, of our holiest truths are derived from Egypt and Babylonia. It is, however, a somewhat different tribute—a mixture of reverence and love—that we owe to the traditions of the life

of the Lord Jesus, and this tribute is not impaired if we seriously and sympathetically criticize the contents of those traditions. We may indeed be compelled to hold that the earliest and the latest, in the order of narration, are different in character from the great bulk of the narratives. But we know by our experience in the Old Testament that for a narrative to be non-historical, does not prevent it from having a religious value.

There are some liberal thinkers who are wont to speak somewhat disparagingly of the representation of Christ as virgin-born; and truly, if we are bound to connect that representation with a doctrine of original sin, we cannot help thinking that it betrays a deficiency of the evangelical spirit, and asking whether its presence in the First Gospel must not be due to some strange accident. If, however, the supposed connexion be a mistake, it becomes possible to hold that the story of the Virgin-Birth has a real religious significance. We cannot indeed affirm that the physiological

virginity of the Redeemer's mother has any religious value. But we may find a deep meaning in the story, if regarded, as the early Christian writers regard the "estate of matrimony," symbolically. We may take it, in the first place, as a poetic and popular symbol of a primary religious truth—of the truth that the inestimable blessings which, for us, have their fountain-head in the Crucified, do indeed come from above (John viii. 23), and not from below, are not humanly produced, but have their origin in God. As this is expounded by Dante,—[1]

> Their wax, and he who shapes it, are howe'er
> Of different kind; whence 'neath the Ideal Seal
> Various degrees of lustre must appear.
>
> More exquisitely if the wax were moulded,
> The heavens exerting all their energies,
> Then would the Seal's full lustre be unfolded.

Accepting this view, the story expresses a form of thought parallel to, but different from, those of the pre-existence of Christ and of

[1] *Paradiso,* canto xiii. lines 67–69 (Wright's translation).

His being the very Word of God made flesh.[1] These forms are all equally prized by us as expressive symbols, but we are bound to distinguish them, and must not, in critical writings, use the Johannine phrase "he became flesh" of the Virgin-Birth, however natural this may have been for great church-theologians (see the Nicene Creed), in the age before criticism had come into existence.

But there are still some "fragments that remain," and in gathering them up we may again seek help from Dante, who was preserved, not only by his theological lore from being a shallow thinker, but also by his poetical genius from mistaking symbol for crude fact. The thirty-third canto of the *Paradiso* shows clearly enough that to mediæval Christians the Virgin Mary was essentially a personification of the divine mercy which both causes and mediates to man the divine

[1] Cp. Lobstein, *The Virgin-Birth of Jesus* (Crown Theological Library), p. 96; Schmiedel, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, "Mary," i., §§ 16, 17.

pardon. Dante is no rationalist, but he intuitively pierces to the spiritual centre of orthodox theology. Listen to his words, or at least to such a reflexion of their meaning as our language admits.[1]

O Virgin Mother, daughter of thy Son!
Humblest, yet most exalted of our race,
Forecast of counsel in the Eternal One!

Here unto us a midday torch thou art
Of Charity; and unto men below
The living streams of Hope thou dost impart.

Lady, to thee such worth and power are given,
That whoso grace desires, and asks not thee,
Desires to fly, without a wing, to heaven.

Thy kindness succoureth not him alone
Who asks thy aid; but oft spontaneously
Runs in advance, and is, unasked for, shown.

In thee dwells Mercy—Pity dwells in thee—
In thee Munificence—in thee abounds
Whate'er of Goodness may in creature be.

If anyone doubts the theory here proposed, I would ask him to see what our poet says of Beatrice and Lucia. That these figures are essentially personifications, is beyond question, and yet the personification, aided in each case

[1] *Paradiso,* canto xxxiii. lines 1–3 and 10–21.

by the ascription of a historic name to the personified abstraction, is so effective that a simple reader might suppose the description to be put forth as historical. And I think that the Christian of to-day may follow Dante in so using a historic name and person. We too, like the sovereign poet, cannot be so absorbed in the child-saviour as to forget His mother. And since we know so little about her historically, we may well be pardoned for using her as a symbol.[1] To some of us the Virgin Mother may be the indispensable poetic symbol of the highest and holiest aspect of the womanly ideal; to others—or indeed to the same persons in a different mood—the equally poetic symbol of a too easily forgotten aspect—the maternal—of the divine nature.

[1] In doing this we can take no account of the extra-canonical story of Mary (cp. *Encyclopædia Biblica*, "Mary," i., § 21). This must be obvious. But a little consideration will further show that we must not blur the outlines of our mental picture by borrowing from those references to Mary in our Gospels which are outside the preludes to the First and Third Gospels. Indeed, the real source of the deep Christian feeling towards Mary is Luke i. 26–ii. 19.

We in the West may have been diverted from recognizing this aspect by the repellent form of much Eastern symbolism, but we are the losers by this, as there are some signs that we are now beginning to suspect.[1] The older volume of Scripture contains one passage in which this most touching aspect of the divine nature is beautifully expressed,—"Can a woman forget a sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, though [by a very bold imagination] they should forget, yet will I not forget thee" (Isa. xlix. 15).

I shall not require to be as long in considering the statement, so difficult, and yet as soon as we get the right point of view, so transparent, of the Descent of Christ to the nether world.

[1] Cp. Tyrrell, *Lex Orandi*, p. 175, "In the last resort we must see in her (Mary) the revelation of a new aspect of the Divine Goodness, with which we are thus put into fuller and more fruitful communication." Also Grainger, *The Soul of a Christian*, p. 186, "It is a striking fact that a new worship of the Divine Mother is springing up in such a way that her attributes are no longer centred on Mary, but on the Supreme."

It is given in its fullest form, though without the necessary sequel of the Strong One's victorious exit, in a passage which is probably a later insertion;[1] but is none the less useful as a record of an early form of belief. The passage runs thus, "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea-monster, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt. xii. 40). There is also an apparently full record in 1 Pet. iii. 18 *ff.*, "Being put to death in the flesh but revived in the spirit, in which also he went and proclaimed to the spirits in ward, who formerly disobeyed, when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noe." This passage, however, has been much misunderstood, and recent research throws much doubt on the prevalent view that it refers to the descent of Christ into Hades.[2] A sounder illustration may be derived from the words of Christ in Rev. i. 18, "I am the first and the last, and the Living One; and I

[1] See Note, p. 251.

[2] See pp. 103 *f.*

was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of Death and of Hades," where the second half of the verse is a partly translated myth of the Descent into Hades. From the two passages—Matt. xii. 40 and Rev. i. 18—taken together, we are able to learn that the descent into the "heart of the earth" was a scene in the great drama of the struggle between the divine Redeemer and the dragon of chaos and lawlessness. For the "sea-monster" (κῆτος) in Matthew, like the "great fish" in Jonah, is certainly the dragon (*tannîn*) of which we read in Job xxvii. 12 and Isa. xxvii. i., li. 9 (cp. Ezek. xxix. 3, xxxii. 2), and which is equivalent to the Tiâmat of the Babylonian epic of Creation.[1] We learn too that the sojourn of three days and three nights in the nether world followed upon the

[1] See *Encyclopædia Biblica,* "Dragon," "Jonah," § 4. Note that in Jonah ii. 4, the "great fish" is identified with Sheól. The identification may be attested only by the editor who inserted the psalm (Jon. ii.) and called it Jonah's prayer, but is doubtless much earlier. See *Encyclopædia Biblica,* col. 2570.

Redeemer's death, and was succeeded by His triumphant ascension, in which He carried with Him the keys of the city called Death[1] or Hades, as a token of His overlordship. Evidently the death of the Redeemer is here represented, in mythological style, as His being swallowed up by the dragon.[2] Can we help being reminded of the old myth embodied in Rev. xii., where the dragon is said to have "stood before the woman to devour her child as soon as it was born" (*v.* 4)?

This parallelism naturally suggests the idea that the representation of the Christ as having descended into Hades may have been Jewish before it became Christian, and Babylonian before it became Jewish. Nor is the search for evidence altogether fruitless. The Mandæans, that strange sect (not yet extinct) on the banks of the Euphrates, to which I have

[1] "Death" (Heb. *mâveth*) is often a synonym of Sheól (Ps. vi. 5, ix. 13, xxii. 15, lxviii. 20, lxxxix. 48, cvii. 18, Isa. xxviii. 15; cp. Rev. i. 18, vi. 8 [personification], xx. 13 *f.*).

[2] See, however, the next paragraph.

already referred, and whose highly mixed religious system is Babylonian in its lowest stratum, told of a divine Hero,[1] who was commissioned by his "fathers," the so-called "Great Ones,"[2] to descend into the nether world, to wage successful war with the king of darkness, and to liberate the souls of the righteous, and restore them to the world of light. The representation of the Hero as fighting with the powers of darkness seems at first sight to fill a gap in the Biblical myth.[3] The Christ, as one might think, must have had to fight with these potentates before He could quit the City of Death as a victor. This view would seem to be favoured by the parallelism asserted in Matt. xii. 40 between the experience of Jonah and that of the Christ, and it is very possible that the Jews had a

[1] Hibil Ziwâ, son of Mandâ d'Hayyê. See Brandt, *Mandäische Schriften,* pp. 138 *ff.,* cp. pp. 150 *ff.*; *Mand. Religion,* pp. 182–184; Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos,* pp. 364, 382.

[2] See Note ix., p. 250.

[3] Let me recall once more that "myth" does not mean "fable."

Messiah-story (now lost) which agreed with the Mandæan in this respect. Evidently, however, the Christian instinct in general was against it. The New Testament writers as a rule prefer to represent the battle between Jesus Christ and the demons as having taken place in His earthly lifetime (see *e.g.* Matt. xii. 29, Luke x. 18, John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11), and the cross as His triumphal throne (Col. ii. 15; cp. John xii. 23, 32).

That the Mandæan story is only a development of a Babylonian myth is evident. The conception of the nether world as a city with gates is certainly in the first instance Babylonian, though it was adopted, probably at an early date, by the Israelites.[1] There is in fact

[1] See Isa. xxxviii. 10, Jon. ii. 7 (where "earth" is used as a synonym for the subterranean world), Ps. ix. 14, cvii. 18, Job xvii. 16, xxxviii. 17; cp. Wisd. xvi. 13, Psalms of Solomon xvi. 2, Matt. xvi. 18. All, it is true, late passages. The expression "keys of Death" is thoroughly Jewish (see Wetstein or Bousset on Rev. i. 18). Philologically there is no call to seek out a parallel in Mithraism (J. M. Robertson, *Pagan Christs*, pp. 200, 353); and mythologically Babylonia claims priority.

an elaborate Babylonian story of the descent of Istar to the nether City. Possibly it is the sole survivor of a class. For instance, there was surely a story of the Descent of Marduk,[1] which, if we could recover it, would have a prior claim to consideration, Marduk being so clearly analogous to the Jewish and Christian Messiah. But the "Descent of Istar" (now well known through popular as well as learned books on Assyriology) is quite sufficient for illustrative purposes. The story is really a combination of three myths—one in which the goddess descended to the "land without return" under compulsion, a second in which Tammuz made the same unavoidable descent, and a third in which Istar went of her own accord to seek for and rescue her dead consort Tammuz.[2] Just so, the references to the Descent of Christ appear to have been of a twofold character. Sometimes He was com-

[1] See Zimmern, *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., p. 371.

[2] Cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 573 *ff.*

pared to the prophet Jonah, who was swallowed up by a "great fish," which is identified in the so-called prayer of Jonah (Jon. ii. 2) with Sheôl, and is evidently a degenerate form of the mythic dragon; at other times (and doubtless this became the favourite representation[1]) as having entered the City of Death of His own accord, and for a purpose of His own. A few lines may appropriately be quoted here, taken from an early section of the "Descent of Istar," and illustrative of those triumphant words in Rev. i. 18, "I have the keys of Death and of Hades."

When Istar arrived at the gate of the land without return,[2]
She spoke to the watchman of the gate:
Ho! watchman—open thy gate;
Open thy gate that I may enter.
If thou dost not open thy gate, if thou refusest me admission,
I will smash the door, break the bolt.
I will smash the threshold, break open the portals.[3]

---

[1] See chaps. xvii.–xxvii. of the apocryphal "Gospel of Nicodemus."

[2] Less probably, according to Zimmern, "without compassion."

[3] Jastrow, *Rel. Bab. Ass.*, pp. 568 *f.*

What Istar here threatens, the divine Hero of the Mandæans carries out. It is consonant with the dignity of Christ to suppose that all that He required to do, according to the second form of the story, was to threaten, and that the keys of the City of Death were at once yielded up.

We can now return to 1 Pet. iii. 18 *ff.* Most people suppose that the writer of 1 Peter alludes here to a form of the belief in the *Descensus ad inferos*, which represented the object of the Christ as being to make a spiritual proclamation to certain imprisoned spirits. Surely this cannot be. The object of the Descent (regarded as a voluntary act of the Christ) must have been the same as that of the divine Hero of the Mandæan belief, viz. to liberate the souls of the righteous of past ages. Recent study of the "Similitudes" in the Book of Enoch, however, leads us to the conviction that the preacher referred to in *v.* 19 must be Enoch, a hero who, originally of solar origin, receives

(not inappropriately) such wonderful honour in later Jewish literature; indeed, in chap. lxxi. of the Book of Enoch he is even identified with the Son of man, *i.e.* the Messiah.[1] If so, the only question can be whether the subject of the verb in 1 Pet. iii. 19 is the pre-existent Christ, represented (as the first readers presumably knew) by Enoch, or whether we are to follow Dr Rendel Harris,[2] and read ἐν ᾧ καὶ Ενωχ, "in which also Enoch (went and made proclamation)." The "spirits in ward" (τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν) will probably be the fallen angels, of whom the so-called Book of Enoch has so much to say.[3]

I have spoken of the statement of the Descent of Christ into the Underworld as having a mythological origin. What, then, is this origin? The question can now be answered with a probability which will, I

[1] See Baldensperger, *Die Messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen*, pp. 17 *f.*

[2] See his article in the *Expositor*, April 1901. Obviously Ενωχ might easily fall out after ἐν ᾧ.

[3] See Dr Charles's Commentary.

suspect, go on increasing. And the explanation is that underlying such accounts is the observation that from time to time certain of the heavenly "lights," and more especially the sun, become invisible.[1]

The parallel Egyptian accounts (of which Osiris and the justified Osirian souls are the heroes), not less than the Babylonian "Descent of Istar," and the stories of the Descent into the Underworld of heroes like Ea-bani and Gilgames, besides the Greek myth of Persephone, and the so-called descents into Hades[2] (καταβάσεις εἰς Ἅιδου), ultimately have the same origin, *i.e.* were suggested by the same primitive myth.

One important detail still remains to be accounted for. According to Matt. xii. 40 (a valuable early Christian statement, see NOTE x.), the period occupied by the Descent of Christ was three full days and nights. The evangelical traditions too sometimes speak of

[1] Cp. Zimmern, *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., p. 388.
[2] Cp. Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, p. 182.

our Lord as rising "after three days" (*e.g.* Matt. xxvii. 63), though sometimes (compare the parallel case of the festival of Osiris) they say that the Resurrection was to take place "on the third day" (*e.g.* Matt. xvi. 21). Similar definitions of time to that in Matt. xii. 40 are often given in traditional religious statements. Jonah's three days in the fish have been already mentioned. In Rev. xii. 14 the Messiah's mother is said to have been "nourished for a time and times and half a time," which is parallel to statements in Dan. vii. 25 and xii. 7. In Rev. xi. 9, 11 the two witnesses slain by the dragon lie dead for three days and a half, and then arise and ascend to heaven. In the Mandæan story, Mandâ d'Hayyê (the father of the divine Hero already referred to) is called a "little boy of three years and one day."[1] In the Greek myth of Leto (see NOTE II.), Apollo slays the serpent Pytho on the fourth day after his birth, and in the cultus of the Phrygian deity Attis the festival of his

[1] Brandt, *Mandäische Religion*, pp. 218 *f.*

resurrection takes place on the fourth day after the lamentations over his death.

Nor ought I to leave unmentioned that the duration of such a period as is referred to in Dan. vii. 25 and xii. 7 is given in a Babylonian text as three months, ten days, and half a day.[1]

It is not very difficult to account for the three months (or three months and a little more) in some of these statements. From our present point of view, it means the period from the winter solstice to the vernal equinox[2] —a most fit symbol for the afflictive domination of the powers of evil upon earth. But can we explain the three days in the same way? Some explanation certainly is demanded.

[1] These parallels are given by Gunkel (*Zum religiösen Verständniss*, etc., pp. 80–82), except the last but one, which comes from Pfleiderer (*Das Christusbild*, p. 69, note 1). For the last see Zimmern (*K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., p. 389), who also mentions the three days of the Adonis-festival in spring. On Attis and Adonis a general reference must suffice to Frazer's learned and acute *Golden Bough*.

[2] Cp. Gunkel, *Schöpfung*, p. 390; Zimmern, *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., p. 389.

The apostle Paul, when he says (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4) that Christ died and that He rose again "according to the Scriptures," in reality points to a pre-Christian sketch of the life of Christ, partly—as we have seen—derived from widely-spread non-Jewish myths, and embodied in Jewish writings.[1] May we hold that the statement "three days and three nights" was taken from one such myth, and the statement "two days" (implied in "on the third day") from another?[2] And, to account for the three days, may we suppose that this specification is merely a modification of the three months, *i.e.* that it meant originally the period of winter? The sense produced would certainly be a good one, viz. that while the gracious, kindly God, or divine Hero, is in the nether world the upper world of men

[1] See Note xi., p. 252.

[2] J. M. Robertson's *Christianity and Mythology* was not at hand when the above was written. He says (p. 405, n. 7), "The confusion of the Gospels as to the time between Jesus' death and resurrection is doubtless due to the fact that other cults varied in this respect." It is only just to Robertson to mention this.

undergoes a winter of misery. But I think that we are bound to look further, and seek for another solution of the problem which will adequately account for the "three days." May not Prof. Winckler be right in supposing that the three days were borrowed from another myth relative to the moon-god, and that originally they were the days during which, near the time of the new moon in spring, the moon becomes invisible?[1] The same scholar is also of opinion that the forty days between the Resurrection and the Ascension of Christ[2] may originally (*i.e.* in a pre-Christian myth out of which the Jewish and Christian representations grew) have meant the forty days during which, as the ancients well knew, the Pleiades become invisible.[3] In this case the forty days of the

[1] *Geschichte Israels*, ii. 84; cp. Zimmern, *op. cit.*, pp. 362, 366, 384, 389.

[2] Acts i. 3, the only passage where the interval is specified.

[3] On the importance of the Pleiades in antiquity, see Winckler, *op. cit.*, p. 83, and cp. *Enc. Biblica*, col. 4781.

evangelical tradition were properly the interval between the death and the resurrection of Christ; *i.e.* from a purely archæological point of view, the Resurrection and the Ascension were one and the same thing.[1] In fact, the resurrection and ascension of the solar heroes were naturally identical, and the archæological theory here expounded is that myths of solar deities supplied details for the close of that story of the Messiah, which, according to a highly satisfying theory, preceded the appearance of the Christ of history.

But I cannot and ought not to leave this important matter here. In spite of a Churchman's natural inclination to a reverential reticence, I am bound to say that the form of the spiritual truth of Christ's Resurrection and Ascension can be explained by archæology. Provisionally and tentatively it may be possible to explain the form in each case as a postulate of faith, but in the light of what has been shown to be the probable origin of the form

[1] Zimmern expresses this view (*op. cit.*, p. 389).

of the belief in the Descent, we cannot consider this explanation very plausible. That there are mythic parallels for the statement (less emphasized in our documents than we might have expected) of the Ascension is beyond question. Not to dwell on the myths of Adonis and Heracles, the Babylonian solar deities who "descend" (*arâdu*) necessarily "ascend" (*elû*) afterwards. There are also Ascensions which are not preceded by Descents into the Underworld, *e.g.*, that of Mithra the solar deity,[1] so famous in later times. One is also reminded of the Babylonian story of Etana,[2] the proud boast of Israel's oppressor in Isa. xiv. 13, and the Egyptian statements (which, as I have noticed, occur already in the Pyramid Texts) of the ascent of the Egyptian kings into heaven.[3] Nor

[1] See Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie* (1903), p. 184.

[2] See Zimmern, *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., pp. 564 *ff.*; Jastrow, *Rel. of Bab. and Ass.*, pp. 519 *ff.*

[3] Cp. the popular stories of the translation of Romulus and of Alexander the Great (without death), and of Julius and Augustus Cæsar (after death).

must one be debarred from mentioning the Old Testament stories of Enoch[1] and Elijah, and the ascensions spoken of imaginatively in later Jewish literature (Moses, Levi, Isaiah), together with the definite statement in the Apocalypse of Baruch (xxx. 1) that the Messiah "shall return into glory."[2] Must we not therefore admit that the Ascension, like the Descent, is a wide-spread form of belief, and that this form of belief is ultimately derived from a primitive Oriental myth?

If so, does it not at once become probable that the form of the belief in (or spiritual truth of) the Resurrection of Christ is also of mythic origin? I am aware that some learned

[1] See *Encyclopædia Biblica*, "Enoch." The popular tendency to believe in ascensions appears in Deut. xxx. 12, "Who shall go up for us to heaven," and Assumption of Moses, x. 9, "And God will exalt thee, and He will cause thee to approach to the heaven of the stars" (cp. Isa. xiv. 13).

[2] Cp. Charles, *ad loc.*; Baldensperger, *Die Messianisch-apokalypt. Hoffnungen*, p. 164, note 1. Both Charles and Ryssel (in Kautzsch's German *Apocrypha*) render "in glory." But surely "into glory" gives the writer's meaning better.

Anglican theologians consider the Resurrection of our Lord to be not merely a matter of faith but a historically proved fact. I will not now enter upon an examination of passages which has been made often enough, but simply ask, Have these theologians given a long study to Oriental mythology? This is a subject which cannot be taken up profitably under compulsion; rather it is one which the student must grow into by degrees. We cannot on this ground venture to neglect it, but we ought not to be hasty in forming conclusions respecting it. Without claiming infallibility, I hope that I have complied with the necessary conditions, and won the right to express a judgment on the theory before us. I hold, then, that the form of the statement of our Lord's Resurrection does, from an archæological point of view, appear to be of mythic origin. But this is far from exhausting my meaning. As a student of religion, I distinguish between the form of the truth that is believed and the very truth itself. I lay no small stress upon this, but I

must not say more at present, because I have first to mention those mythic stories of resurrection with which the outward form of the Gospel narratives of the Resurrection of Christ must inevitably be compared.

Here, as in other cases, it is highly important to limit our field of investigation. Our instances shall be taken from Babylonia, Egypt, Phœnicia, and Phrygia. The Babylonian deity of the springtide sun (Marduk), who died, also rose again; his chief festival went by the name of the "standing up" (*tabû*).[1] It was the festival of the New Year at the time of the vernal equinox. Resurrection too enters into the elaborate Egyptian myth of Osiris, who after a violent death lived on (as the sun of yesterday lives on in the sun of to-day) in the person of his son Horus. Adonis and Attis also were said to

[1] Zimmern, *op. cit.*, p. 371. The beautiful epithet of Marduk, "who loveth to make the dead to live," according to Zimmern, is not a reference to the possibility of a resurrection, but means "who loveth to heal those who are sick unto death."

have revived after death, and, like Osiris and Marduk, were honoured by yearly festivals.

Surely it must be clear (1) that the view presented of the possible origin of this form of belief is not exposed to the objections raised to the various vision-hypotheses, and (2) that the hold which the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ obtained upon the Church can now be plausibly accounted for.

Now too we can perhaps more easily account for the early Christian transformation of the sense of certain Old Testament passages, such as Isa. liii. 10 and Ps. xvi. 10. The transformation seems to have been unconsciously effected, and in the first instance by the Jews to justify the belief in the Messiah's resurrection derived from a wide-spread mythic tradition. The Christians (see 1 Cor. xv. 4 and parallels) only followed the example of the Jews. It was natural that both Jews and Christians should look out for previsions of this great event in the Scriptures, the received interpretation of prophecy having become largely eschatological.

In speaking of "the Jews," I mean, of course, not the whole community or its official leaders, but only a certain section of the people.

It is perfectly right to ask how the Christian faith is affected by this hypothesis. To this it may frankly be answered that it is not affected at all. The discovery that a form of belief is of non-historical origin (*i.e.* belongs to another sphere than that of history) has nothing to do with the truth or falsehood of the belief itself. Whatever else can be subverted by criticism, the belief in the resurrection of Christ is safe. More than this I need not say now. It is time that I should attempt to show what is the essence of the three companion-beliefs, the Descent, the Resurrection, and the Ascension, —that essence which, to a fair-minded student, is independent of criticism. In order to run the least risk of alienating those whom I desire to carry with me, I shall borrow all that I can from a supreme Christian poet, and something too from a singularly open-minded Roman Catholic writer of our own day. If Father

Tyrrell can display such truly Christian candour and such reverence for historical facts, no one can take offence if I too, as a Christian historian, seek to manifest these qualities, and if, going (I hope I may say) only a little beyond him, I draw a distinction between a semi-mythic narrative and the spiritual truths, or beliefs, to which, at the period of the formation of Christianity, it gave the necessary vehicle.

First, as to the Descent into Hades. If the form of this belief is ultimately a myth, it is at any rate, as transfigured by Christians, a very significant myth. The leading idea of it seems to me to be that Christ, to whom (according to the grand conception of the primitive Christians) the Crucifixion was not a defeat but a victory, would not be glorified alone, but determined to be accompanied by a multitude of righteous spirits. According to this view the Descent into Hades is only the first stage of the Ascension—of an Ascension in which Christ was certainly the most prominent but not the only figure. To show

this a supreme poet was required, and this poet we have in the author of the *Divine Comedy.* It is hardly too much to say that no prose description could possibly equal the grandeur of the third and fourth lines of the following passage, at least in the original :— [1]

Then he, to whom my covert thought was known,
Gave answer: I had lately reached this round,
When lo! arrived a great and glorious Guest,
Whose head with wreath of victory was crowned.
The soul of man's first Parent hence he drew,
Abel his son, and also Noah's shade,
Moses the lawgiver, and, just and true,
The Patriarch Abraham; David,—Israel,
His father, and his sons that call obeyed,
And Rachel fair, whose love he earned so well.
For these and many others grace he gained:
Know—that till these with happiness were blest,
No human souls salvation e'er obtained.

Underneath this fine description lies the very

[1] *Inferno,* canto iv., lines 51–54, Wright's translation. The lines specially referred to above for their grandeur occur in the speech of Virgil in reply to a question put by Dante. The devout Roman poet answers,—

(Rispose :) Io era nuovo in questo stato,
Quando ci vidi venire un possente
Con segno di vittoria incoronato.

idea which, according to Mr Tyrrell, constitutes the special religious value of the belief in the Descent, viz. "that Christ is the redeemer of all men from the beginning to the end; one whose day even Abraham rejoiced to see; that He is the realization of the dreams of the old-world seers and prophets."[1]

Next, as to the Ascension. We have seen that the form of this belief, being the correlative of that of the Descent (cp. Eph. iv. 9), may very possibly be of mythic origin. If this be accepted, we have to consider what is the essential underlying truth. Let us, then, suppose that, by a mystery of heavenly wisdom, a star-spirit has disappeared in the underworld; what follows from this? Surely to an ancient believer in myths it would be self-evident that the star-spirit will at length reappear in the heaven to which he belongs. Using this as a symbol of religious thought, does not the Christian conscience affirm that if a personality, filled with

[1] Tyrrell, *Lex Orandi*, p. 181.

the divine Spirit, passes out of sight, it must afterwards again become visible, and this time in all its beauty and resplendent majesty, in "Jerusalem that is above, which is our mother" (Gal. iv. 26, Revised Version)? And if, from the same point of view, we regard this mythically expressed statement as the symbol of an inward experience, must we not say—slightly altering and expanding Mr Tyrrell's words[1]—that "the exaltation of humanity through the death of self-sacrifice" is "embodied and set forth symbolically in the phenomenal order" in the crown of all the Ascension stories, the narrative of the Ascension of Christ?[2] Such an idea, for which Eph. ii. 1, 6 may be compared, appears to me to give a still richer meaning to the narrative, and it is certainly unaffected by the mythological origin which the new school would now assign to it.

Lastly, as to the Resurrection. Here too I

[1] *Lex Orandi*, p. 184.

[2] Mark xvi. 19 (in the appended passage; see *Enc. Bibl.*, cols. 1767, 1880), Luke xxiv. 51, Acts i. 9–11; cp. Luke ix. 51, John xx. 17.

can only venture to report, so far as I am able, the affirmations of the Christian conscience. First, then, among the truths affirmed by that conscience is the uniqueness of Jesus Christ's personality, from which follows, by a necessary inference of faith, its indestructibility. Apart from all theological formulations, it remains true to the Christian that One who was in such close and constant communion with God, and had such keen spiritual insight, and such potent spiritual influence, could not become like a quenched lamp, or be reduced to the shadowy, negative existence assigned to the departed by the later Jews. Those who draw the above necessary inference will naturally go on to regard the spiritual Resurrection of Christ (which they also infer) as involving the spiritual resurrection of His followers, and at the same time as a symbol of the new moral life of redeemed humanity and of each of its members[1] (cp. Eph. ii. 1, 5*f.*; Col. ii. 12*f.*).

Others, however, will go still further, and

[1] Cp. Tyrrell, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

affirm that a body is necessary to the integrity of human nature, from which they will infer the bodily Resurrection both of Christ and of His followers. This surely is the affirmation of the ordinary Christian conscience. How this is possible, conscience cannot say. The favourite theory,[1] that the human spirit after death will be free to organize a suitable spiritual body from its new environment, does not belong to the sphere of the conscience, which, however, by one of faith's inferences, may affirm the resurrection-body of Christ to have been suitably glorious, and to be typical of that of His true followers.

All this is, of course, absolutely unaffected by archæological criticism of the form of the Christian belief in the Lord's Resurrection. The great question is whether we have that faith in Jesus which enables us to infer from His spiritual nature, as represented in the Synoptic Gospels, that He must have "passed

[1] On St Paul's teaching, see Prof. Charles, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, "Eschatology," § 99.

from death unto life"—unto a new and glorious life with His heavenly Father. If criticism claims perfect liberty, so also does the Christian conscience, and such inferences of faith as I have described cannot be overthrown by criticism.

To sum up what I have been saying last. The four forms of Christian belief which we have been considering are the Virgin-birth of Jesus Christ, His Descent into the nether world, His Resurrection, and His Ascension. On the ground of facts supplied by archæology, it is plausible to hold that all these arose out of a pre-Christian sketch of the life, death,[1] and exaltation of the expected Messiah, itself ultimately derived from a widely current mythic tradition respecting a solar deity. There is, of course, nothing disparaging to the Christian beliefs in such a theory, for before this tradition had been (in part) appropriated by pious Jews (from whom it passed to the followers of Jesus of Nazareth) it was

[1] See Note xi., p. 252.

already, by a natural fitness—or shall we say ?—by a divine overruling, becoming on a small scale the story of a divine Redeemer. Still the Christianized story of the opening and the closing scenes of the earthly life of the Redeemer has acquired a special right of existence through the essential Christian truths enshrined in it. To these truths, which required and found a suitable casket, the faith of the Christian is pledged. The chief of them are,—the uniqueness of the personality of the Lord Jesus, and the immense worth of His act of absolute self-sacrifice; then, by inference, the indestructibleness of His personality, its perpetual redemptive capacity, and its identity with that manward aspect of the Divine Nature, so full of mingled grandeur and compassion, which, by early efforts of theological thought, acquired the names of the Messiah, the Son of God, the Word of God. If this explanation be wrong, let a theory which accounts better for all the various facts be brought forward. If, however, it commends

itself to those who would fain adjust our Church to the progress of knowledge, let it be viewed in all its bearings, corrected and improved, and then allowed to form part of the common heritage of educated Christian people.

PART III

Not long ago I was speaking of the statement of the Virgin-Birth of Christ, and the slight attestation it receives in the earliest Christian records. The discovery which I have next to mention has a close bearing on this subject. It belongs to the domain of textual criticism, which some of those who are fond of large views are perhaps too much inclined to neglect. They forget that without textual criticism the large views of historical essayists would lack an assured basis, and their conclusions be involved in uncertainty. The time, however, has come when all students must take more account of textual criticism, and recognize that a new day has dawned upon it. I cannot help thinking that even the popular mind has

begun to suspect what is happening, thanks to this discovery. You will guess what it is when I add the names of the discoverers, Mrs Gibson and Mrs Lewis. In the Syriac manuscript found by these two learned Cambridge ladies in the library of the Sinai convent, and published by them in 1894, this is how the last error in the first of the two genealogies of Jesus Christ was found to run: "Jacob begat Joseph; Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the virgin, begat Jesus, who is called the Christ" (Matt. i. 16).

The discovery is certainly a valuable one, but some popular writers in 1894 exaggerated its degree of importance, when they ventured to surmise that we had at last found out the original text of the passage. Not much experience is required to suggest caution. "To whom was betrothed Mary the virgin," and "who is called the Christ," have all the appearance of being parenthetical insertions. It so happens that we have long had a mass of variants which also point back to an earlier

textual type than that represented by the official text, but which were almost useless,[1] for want of a sufficient amount of insight on the part of critics in general. Fortunately, however, by the time that the Gibson-Lewis manuscript was published, textual criticism had made such advances that special scholars were able to make the most of it in connexion with the previously existing critical material.[2]

That the original text was distinctly Ebionite, *i.e.* that it was the work of one who believed that our Lord was the son of Joseph,[3] cannot be liable to doubt. In this respect it agrees with the genealogy in Luke iii.

[1] See *Encyclopædia Biblica*, "Mary," i., §§ 13, 14, and cp. "Gospels," § 22.

[2] See the correspondence in the *Academy*, from Nov. 17, 1894, to June 19, 1895; also Conybeare, *Hibbert Journal*, vol. i. (1902–1903), pp. 96-102.

[3] Irenæus (iii. 21, 1) says that the Ebionites declared Jesus to have been the son of Joseph, following those who interpreted "virgin" in Isa. vii. 14 as "young woman," and Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.*, vi. 17) that Symmachus the Ebionite rests his heresy on Matthew's Gospel. See especially *Encyclopædia Biblica*, "Mary," i., § 15.

23-38;[1] for no critical student can fail to see that the text of *v.* 23 has been interfered with in various ways, and originally stated positively that Jesus was the son of Joseph.[2] It is right to add that "there survive even now traces of a dislocation between them and the Gospels in which they are incorporated." Indeed, any reader can see that the First Gospel begins best with "The birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise," and that Luke iii. 32, "And the Holy Spirit descended . . . upon him," is followed most naturally by "And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from Jordan." If, however, we remove the genealogies, there is no trace left in those two Gospels of the representation of the true Messiah as born of a virgin. Yet who can say that the view of Jesus Christ that they give is not one

[1] Dr A. Wright remarks that the genealogies in Matthew and Luke "seem to have been the work of Hebrew Christians, probably of Ebionites" (*Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, p. 257).

[2] See *Encyclopædia Biblica*, "Gospels," § 22; "Mary," i., § 7, with note 1.

that touches the heart and may transfigure the life?

For two companion facts of textual criticism I will go to Mr Conybeare. This zealous Oxford scholar has produced from the so-called "Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila"[1] a fresh confirmation of the view that the original reading in the first of the two genealogies was simply "and Jacob begat Joseph, and Joseph begat Jesus, who is called Christ." This is in fact cited by Aquila the Jew as the text of the passage in Matthew, only after "begat Joseph" the text of the Dialogue gives "the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ." Mr Conybeare has also shown that Eusebius quotes that famous passage Matt. xxviii. 19 at least eighteen (one may now say twenty-five) times in the form "Go ye, and make disciples of all nations in my name," without the words

[1] Edited by Conybeare, *Anecdota Oxoniensia Classica*, 8th series, 1898, p. 76; cp. pp. xix–xxii. See Schmiedel's criticism, *Encycl. Biblica*, "Mary," i., § 13.

"baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."[1] He has moreover shown reason to believe that both Aphraates and Justin Martyr were ignorant of the now generally received reading,[2] and he has offered the very probable conjecture that the words referred to are an interpolation which was first made in the African text of the Gospel, and which afterwards spread to other local texts.

Surely this could not be omitted in a survey of some of the new facts which appear to justify a more searching criticism of the Bible. As Professor Kirsopp Lake, in his recent inaugural lecture, remarks,—

> We shall have to consider, for instance, in the case of the catholic custom and doctrine of Baptism, how far it is really based on the interpolated (if it be interpolated) text

---

[1] See Conybeare, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1901, pp. 275 *ff.*; *Hibbert Journal*, i., 1902, pp. 102 *ff.*

[2] Cp. Diettrich, *Die nestorianische Taufliturgie* (1903), where, in confirmation of Conybeare's view, it is pointed out that the baptismal liturgy of the Nestorians is without the passage Matt. xxviii. 19.

of Matt. xxviii. 19, and how far it is independent. That baptism is a primitive and catholic custom is beyond all question. It has been usual to trace the origin of that custom to Christ's commands as reported in Matt. xxviii. 19 and Mark xvi. 16. If textual criticism really makes it doubtful that those passages are part of the original text, then it is clearly the duty of the student of early Christian literature to ask whether there is any other evidence that baptism was ordained by Christ, and whether the suggestion is not worth consideration that baptism was a Jewish custom, sanctioned by Christ as an initiatory ceremony, and regarded by the early Church as a necessary and essential rite.[1]

Said I not right that a new day is dawning on the textual criticism of the New Testament, and may I not hope that here, as in all other branches of study, the pain attendant on the removal of prejudices will be the precursor of a keen delight in a fuller revelation of historical reality?

Such are a few of the new facts bearing on the criticism of the New Testament. I have mentioned only those that have some special interest for ordinary Bible students at the

[1] *The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament*: an Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Leiden, on January 27, 1904, by Kirsopp Lake (Oxford, 1904), pp. 22 *f.*

present moment, and for the most part those which have some relation to studies of my own. To New Testament archæology in the usual sense of the word, as understood and partly re-created by Professor Ramsay, I have made no reference. This of course implies no want of interest on my part, but only that the present work has its necessary limitations. I am well aware that a thorough re-examination of the critical views of all the various schools is urgently needed, and that both archæology such as Professor Ramsay and likeminded scholars cultivate and also the newer textual criticism will give invaluable help to those who may be brave enough to undertake it.

PART IV

I NOW turn to the Old Testament, first expressing the hope that I may not thereby contribute to the propping up of the ancient error that the New Testament is the direct continuation of the Old. Students should now at length be beginning to realize that the most various influences contributed to form the intellectual and spiritual *milieu* in which alone the Gospel could have arisen, and any new fact which enables us to understand this *milieu* better is a fact of high importance for Bible-study. Such a work as Bousset's on Jewish Religion in the Age of the New Testament (Berlin, 1903) is full of new facts of this kind, and each new publication of Dr R. H. Charles is almost an event in Bible-study,

through the abundance of its new contributions to the study of Judaism. Into these facts I cannot here enter, though glimpses of some of them have naturally been given in speaking of one section of the Book of Revelation. Nor can I even consider the bearings of the discovery of fragments of the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus,[1] which ought to become fruitful both for the comprehension of Ben Sira's work, and for textual criticism generally. The new facts of which I shall speak here are primarily facts of archæology, including especially Assyriology.

Some students may remark, "So the Old Testament critics are being converted to a belief in Assyriological research." I am afraid there is a popular misunderstanding on this point, for which an old and much-valued friend of my own—Professor Sayce—is unfortunately responsible. Again and again this eager scholar speaks in widely circulated books and booklets as if the higher critics were neglectful

[1] See Note xii., p. 254.

of Assyriology. The critics have protested, but the accusations continue to pour on them with but little mitigation. But surely Professor Sayce has fallen into an error. Can it be that he is thinking of a single critic, who bulks so largely in his mind that he involuntarily speaks of him as a multitude?—I mean Wellhausen, who, in his zeal for Arabic, is still perhaps tempted to keep Assyrian at arm's length, and certainly has not found time to come to terms with his Assyriological opponents.

Surely, too, Professor Sayce greatly exaggerates when he gives us to understand that Assyriological researches have subverted, or are subverting, the whole fabric of the higher criticism. Perhaps his language is not intended to be taken quite literally, but it justly surprises many who are aware that important parts of the material of that fabric are built into the structure of his own theory of the Old Testament. Here again, like the German critic who stands nearest to him, Fritz Hommel,

he is too much under the fascination of a single eminent name — that of Wellhausen. For clearly, by the phrase "higher critics" he really means the same thing that Hommel means by the appalling word "Wellhausenian."[1] But it should be noticed that while "higher critics" in general do agree with Kuenen and Wellhausen in their general arrangement of the component parts of the Old Testament, yet they are willing and almost eager to modify many of the details, and in particular to admit the existence of early elements in works which, as they stand, must be called late.

Still, I have no wish to deny that the so-called "higher critics" in the past were as a rule unduly suspicious of Assyriology as a young and (as they thought) too self-assertive science, and that many of those who now recognize its contributions to knowledge are

[1] For Hommel's own critical views on the Pentateuch see his pamphlet, *Die altorientalischen Denkmäler und das Alte Testament* (Berlin, 1903), pp. 13–17.

somewhat too mechanical in the use of it, and too sceptical as to the influence of Babylonian culture in relatively early times on Syria, Palestine, and even Arabia. And therefore for the exhortation to "consider their ways and be wise," and to expand their aims and methods, I will admit that thanks are due to Professors Sayce and Hommel, and still more to a very different scholar—Professor Hugo Winckler, whose deficient interest in religion and excessive self-reliance must not deter us from learning from a critic who has so keen an eye for new problems whensoever we can.[1]

For my own part, I maintain strongly that the criticism, philology, and archæology of the Old Testament are already much indebted to

[1] Winckler's short work, *Abraham als Babylonier, Joseph als Aegypter* (Berlin, 1903), presents some of his views in the form least likely to give offence to conservative readers. But for a conspectus of all his results we must turn to the first half of the third edition of Schrader's *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (1902). On this great work, the second part of which is by H. Zimmern, see my article, "Babylon and the Bible," *Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1903, pp. 65 *ff.*

Assyriology. The student must, however, be on his guard against the "falsehood of extremes." We do most urgently want a new guide[1] and a much revised criticism, but before we can follow Winckler without reserve on the paths on which he would conduct us, we must, I think, be more convinced that he sees his way clearly enough in textual criticism. Although he is at home in the Hebrew Bible as well as in the inscriptions, it cannot be said that he applies the same critical standard to the received text consistently, nor indeed does he appear to have had an adequate preliminary experience. In some parts of his Old Testament work he is much too unsuspicious; in others (take for instance his treatment of Judg. v. and Ps. xxii.), not perhaps too suspicious, but too unmethodical in his criticism. In other departments, too, he is sometimes, as it seems to me, not strict enough in his criticism, and then again sometimes really hypercritical,

[1] On new guides see article, "Babylon and the Bible," referred to in preceding note.

especially in his application of the mythological key and in his theory (so suggestive in its details) of the later history of Israel. In his treatment of religion, moreover, as I have already remarked, he is far from satisfactory, owing to his unfortunate lack of religious sympathy. With all his earnestness and acuteness, he has not succeeded in making it probable that prophecy, even in its political aspect, can be explained from Babylonia.[1] And neither he nor anyone else has been able to show that the course of the development of the idea of Yahwè (miswritten, since the Reformation period, Jehovah) can be altogether paralleled in Babylonia. That Babylonian and perhaps Arabian influences affected that development at certain points, need not be denied. But the predominant character of the religion of Israel refuses to be accounted for by the "pan-Babylonian" theory.

Having said what was necessary of the

[1] See NOTE XIII., p. 255, and cp. the article mentioned already.

limitations of Professor Winckler (whose enemy I cannot be, for I have more than once come forward in his defence, and whom with a recent German writer I regard as the most stimulative scholar at work on these matters), I now take up a new division of my subject. My aim is to give a conspectus of some of the new facts, important for Old Testament study, for which we are indebted to Assyriology, to Egyptology, and to what in a slightly narrow sense is commonly known among us as archæology. If these facts do not subvert the fabric of the new critical tradition, they at any rate compel lovers of truth to revise, correct, and expand it. This may be a new point of view for some of my hearers, but must I not claim some respect for it on the part of liberal-minded Churchmen?

(1) The first specimen-fact that I shall mention is a complex one; it relates, or is thought to relate, to a group of names in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis. In all recent

works on this difficult book you will find it noticed that several kings of Elam bore names beginning with Kudur, and that an Elamite goddess bore the name Lagamar, from which it is inferred that Chedorlaomer is a genuine historical name. Further, that a very ancient king of Larsa, the Babylonian city of the sun-god, was called Rim-sin, or, in the Sumerian language, Eri-aku, which is thought to be the same as Arioch; for some reason or other—it is supposed—the ancient Hebrew writer used by preference the less natural name Eri-aku, which has become Arioch. Next, it is noticed, quite correctly, as a brilliant discovery, that a king of Babylon, who was, both as a conqueror and as a ruler, one of the greatest kings of the East, was called Hammurabi; he lived in the third millennium B.C.[1] The question then arises, Does this name occur in a recognizable form in Genesis xiv.? The

[1] See *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi.* By L. W. King. Three volumes, 1898–1900.

orthodox theory among both Assyriologists and Hebraists is that the great king's name appears in *v.* 1 as Amraphel.[1]

This requires us indeed to suppose that "Shinar," for some unknown reason, was preferred to the more natural "Bâbel" (*i.e.* Babylon); but we know that the Septuagint sometimes (see Isa. xi. 11, Zech. v. 11), though unfortunately not in Gen. xiv. 1, equates "Shinar" and "Babylonia." Add to this that "Ellasar" is not very unlike "Larsa," that Elam (Assyrian, Êlama, Êlamtu) is the Assyrian name of a country east of Babylonia, and that the Elamites were a conquering race, and appear at the right time for this theory to have claimed suzerainty over Syria and Palestine. Such are the considerations now being urged by not a few archæological critics of Genesis.

I should very much like, however, to call in a candid liberal critic, uncommitted to theories, and ask him what he says to all this. Cer-

[1] See Note xiv., p. 260.

tainly he would be surprised to learn that the Hebrew writer not only believed in the existence of Abraham, but was even able to determine approximately his date. And he would not, I think, be free from the fear that this may be too good to be true. To this perhaps an equally candid conservative would be ready with a reply. Cuneiform tablets have been lately found at Lachish, Gezer, and Taanach. The oldest monument of alphabetic writing in Palestine (the stone of king Mesha) is not older than the ninth century B.C., and Professor Winckler even supposes[1] that cuneiform continued to be used for official purposes after that time. Granted that the scribe "made a muddle"[2] of the names; what more natural, if he was a bad scholar? On the other hand, the uncommitted liberal critic would certainly hold that, taking Gen. xiv. as a whole, it cannot possibly be in its original form, and would ask whether we can base

[1] *Altorientalische Forschungen*, 3rd series, i. 165–174.
[2] Johns, *Expositor*, Oct. 1903, p. 286.

arguments, as the commentators do, on the present forms of the names? Professor Driver indeed, the latest commentator, does not suggest serious textual corruption. He recognizes, however, the chief historical difficulties, and the occasion did not perhaps seem to demand that he should probe the text. Winckler at any rate admits that the narrative has passed through several phases.[1] Gunkel, too, in a general way, admits this, but thinks the internal difficulties cannot be adequately explained by supposing the chapter to be of composite origin.[2] This is certainly true, and indicates that the "muddling" work of the scribes needs to be more searchingly criticized. The sum of the matter is that the "new fact," if used as a key to the existing text, settles nothing, but both justifies and requires a much more searching and complete criticism of the text and of its contents.

(2) Our second new fact is the connexion

[1] *Geschichte Israels*, ii. 32 *ff.*

[2] *Genesis* (in the *Handkommentar*), 1st ed., p. 265.

of the S. Babylonian city of Uru and the Mesopotamian city of Ḥarran with the worship of the Babylonian moon-god Sin. We are told in Gen. xi. 31 that Terah and Abram spent some time, first in Ur-kasdim (Ur of the Chaldees ?), and then in Haran. If Ur-kasdim is Uru, and Haran is Ḥarran, and if the historical existence of Abram has previously been ascertained, we have a right to ask, What is the inner meaning of this specially reported fact—the residence of Abram and his family first in one city of the moon-god and then in another, before their migration to Canaan ? Had Terah and Abram some degree of religious sympathy with the worship of Sin, the moon-god, just as Joseph may conceivably (if chronology and other details favour this view) have sympathized with the worship of the solar disk which was made the state-religion of Egypt by Amen-hotep IV. (Chuen-aten) ? And did they leave the sphere of direct Babylonian religious influence because Hammurabi had signalized his unification of

Babylonia by making Marduk (Merodach) the chief Babylonian deity instead of Sin? These are mere conjectures, but they are at least critical conjectures.[1] It is true that, according to the usual critical view, the Priestly Writer (P), who represents Abram's residence in Haran as consequent on a migration from Ur, harmonizes two distinct traditions. But at any rate the fact remains that tradition connects Abram with two moon-cities. We cannot, however, leave the matter thus. There are reasons for doubting the identification of Ur-kasdim with the S. Babylonian city Uru. Plausible as Professor Winckler's theory may be, it has only this justification,—that it accounts, or seems to account, for Abram's residence in a moon-city, or in two moon-cities. But what if the original tradition did not identify the starting-point of Abram's migration with the moon-city Uru? Of course, it is always possible to hope that the

[1] See Winckler, *Abraham als Babylonier*, etc. (already referred to); but cp. *Enc. Biblica*, "Abraham," § 4, iii.

spade of the excavator may bring something to light which will prove, or at least support, some cherished theory. But as yet no proof at all has been offered for the assumption that Ur-kasdim is represented by the ruins of el-Muḳayyar, six miles south of the Euphrates. Those ruins do undoubtedly represent the ancient Uru, but between Ur-kasdim and Uru a great gulf is fixed, for *Uru was never called Uru of the Chaldeans.* Consequently all that our second new fact (see above) proves for the Old Testament student is that we require a much more searching criticism of the narratives relative to Ur-kasdim than has yet been given.[1]

(3) Our third fact is the discovery (made in Dec. 1901–Jan. 1902, by M. J. de Morgan, on the site of the ancient Susa) of the code of Hammurabi,—that is, of the very king who, as recent writers infer from Gen. xiv. 1, was

[1] See *Enc. Biblica*, "Ur of the Chaldees," § 5, and note that Jensen the Assyriologist has also of late shown himself inclined to separate Ur-kasdim from the moon-city Uru (*K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., p. 365, note 1).

a vassal of the great king of Elam, but who afterwards threw off the supremacy of Elam, and himself became over-lord of Syria and Palestine. May we venture to assume that, not only the Babylonian language and script obtained currency among the official class of Palestine, but also, if not the code of Hammurabi himself, at any rate legal rules which were analogous to, or a reflexion of, those contained in that code? Do we find that the so-called patriarchal narratives of Genesis presuppose legal usages in accordance with the code of Hammurabi?[1] Is there any

[1] This question is answered in the affirmative by J. Jeremias, *Moses und Hammurabi* (1903), and D. H. Müller, *Die Gesetze Hammurabi's* (1903). See, however, G. Wildeboer, *De Patriarchen des Ouden Verbonds en de Wetgebing van Hammoerabi* (1904), and cp. Kohler and Peiser, *Hammurabi's Gesetze*, i. (1904), p. 143. C. H. W. Johns' article in Hastings, *Bible Dictionary* (extra volume), I have not yet seen (July 31, 1904). S. A. Cook's *The Laws of Moses and the Code of Hammurabi* (1903) is a judicious, comprehensive introduction to the whole subject, and shows a full knowledge of its recent literature. Dr W. R. Harper's expected volume has not yet appeared (July 1904).

contrast in this respect between those narratives and the earliest extant Israelitish law-book (the Book of the Covenant)? These problems directly concern the student of the history of Israel, and their study should help to bring about a more thorough and penetrating study of the Pentateuch. It is possible enough that in considering them fresh problems may arise which may greatly surprise us; but if our object is truth, we cannot be otherwise than pleased at this result.

(4) Our fourth fact is the occurrence of the name Yau as a component part of several names of Syrian kings in the regal period of Israelitish history, and of Yaum, and perhaps also of Yavè, as elements of personal names in Babylonian contract-tablets of the age of Hammurabi. May we, with Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, infer from this that the Syrian kings referred to, and certain Semitic immigrants in primitive Babylonia, were worshippers of the god Yahwè, who, according to Israelitish tradition, revealed himself to

Moses on Mount Sinai? Or, as I should prefer to put it, was the religion of the prophets a spiritualization of the worship of no relatively small deity, such as the god of a tribe of Kenites, but of one who was widely known and worshipped among Semitic peoples?[1] This is a far more interesting question than any which can arise respecting the origin of the Yahwè-cultus simply out of the Old Testament. And yet without a searching criticism of the Old Testament it cannot, as I think, be at all adequately answered.

(5, 6) Our fifth and sixth facts are the discovery, most probably, of the name 'Ibri (Hebrews), and certainly of the name Israel, the one in the letters from Palestine found at Tel el-Amarna in Egypt in 1887, and dating from the fifteenth century B.C., the other in the triumphal stelè of the Egyptian king Merenptah (about 1250 B.C.), found by Pro-

[1] Cp. Johns, *Expositor*, Oct. 1903, "The Name Jehovah in the Abrahamic Age."

fessor Flinders Petrie at the Egyptian Thebes in 1896. With regard to the former, scholars are no longer inclined to identify the Ḥabiri (the form under which 'Ibri is probably disguised) with the Israelites whom we know, because they fear that it would involve making the conquest of Canaan begin as early as the fifteenth century B.C. The name Ḥabiri is now generally thought to be a comprehensive one,[1] and to include in its reference all those nomad tribes which successively invaded Palestine. Among these were the Israelites of the Book of Joshua, but also, at an earlier time, the "people of Israel" whom Merenptah, in his triumphal inscription, claims to have destroyed.[2] That this "Israel" has a very limited reference, is clear. From the names with which it is associated, its abode would seem to have been in the S. or S.W., if not (the present

[1] Winckler, *Gesch. Israels*, i. 18 *ff.*; *Altoriental. Forschungen*, 3rd series, i. 90–94.

[2] This has been pointed out by Spiegelberg, *Der Aufenthalt Israels in Aegypten* (1904), p. 33.

speaker would add) in the N. Arabian border-land of Palestine.[1]

Let me quote a part of the inscription from Spiegelberg's translation, which may provisionally be accepted :— [2]

Seized is the Kanaan [3] with every evil.
Led away is Askelon,
Taken is Gezer,[4]
Yenoam [5] is brought to nought,
The people of Israel is laid waste,—their crops are not,
Khor [6] has become as a widow for Egypt,
All lands together in peace.
Everyone who roamed about
Is punished by king Merenptah, gifted with life, like the sun every day.

From this passage, and from another new text

[1] Cp. Paton, *Syria and Palestine* (1902), p. 134 ("the region between Egypt and Canaan").

[2] Inserted in *Six Temples of Thebes* (1897), by Flinders Petrie, p. 28.

[3] Pa-kanana was the name of a fortress at the extreme south of Palestine.

[4] Perhaps a Gezer in the N. Arabian border-land. See p. 159.

[5] Yenoam (Yenu'amu) may, as Clermont Ganneau thinks, be the Na'amah of Josh. xv. 41. It is enough, however, to know that "Naam" was a southern clan-name (cp. 1 Chr. iv. 15, Naam, a son of Caleb).

[6] Rather Ḥaru (S.W. Palestine), connected with Ashḥur (p. 264).

which speaks of king Merenptah as "forcing down Gezer," it seems as if S. Palestine, and perhaps some part of the border-land, were in rebellion against the Eygptian dominion.[1] All this, of course, renders it necessary to modify the traditional criticism considerably, or at any rate opens the door for new probabilities.

(7) Our seventh fact is the mass of discoveries made by Mr Macalister at Gezer—not, I incline to think, the Gezer of Merenptah's stelè, just referred to (see p. 158, Note IV.). It is the place still known as Tell Jezer, a little to the S. of Ramleh, where M. Clermont Ganneau found an inscription with the Hebrew word "Gezer." In particular, the imposing megalithic structure, which seems to be a bamah or "high place," is a fascinating discovery. The scarabs which have been found in abundance both in earlier and in later strata indicate a long-continued Egyptian influence. This indeed is only what we might expect; it accords entirely with our previous knowledge

[1] See *Enc. Biblica,* "Egypt," § 60, note 3 (W. M. Müller).

of facts. But when Mr Macalister maintains[1] that these Egyptian objects confirm the statement of the received Hebrew text of 1 Kings ix. 16 that "Pharaoh king of Egypt went up, and took Gezer, and burned it, and gave it to his daughter, Solomon's wife," he treads upon insecure ground. That the place referred to in Kings is Mr Macalister's Gezer, and that Solomon's father-in-law was king of Egypt, are both statements which seem to be highly disputable. Indeed, Mr Macalister's own scarabs testify against him. For why should the Pharaoh have made a raid upon the territory where (as we are assured) Egyptian influence had for a long time been dominant? I need not say that this is not meant in any way as a disparagement of this explorer.

(8) All these seven facts both invite and require further discussion. It would be easy to add to their number, but I shall only add one more of the first importance. It is the

[1] *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement,* Jan. 1903, p. 11.

existence of passages in the Assyrian inscriptions in which reference is made to N. Arabian regions near the southern border of Palestine, called respectively Muṣri and Kûs.[1] This opens up a new line of inquiry, viz. as to whether some or even many of the passages in the Old Testament which have been supposed to refer to Miṣraim (Egypt) and the African Kûsh (Ethiopia), do not really refer to Muṣri

[1] See especially "North Arabia and the Bible" (a defence called forth by some controversial pages in Dr Budge's *History of Egypt*), by Hugo Winckler, *Hibbert Journal*, April 1904; and cp. Cheyne, "Pressing Needs of the Old Testament Study," in the same Journal, July 1903; and "Babylon and the Bible," Oct. 1903; also Cheyne, *Enc. Biblica*, "Mizraim," and *Critica Biblica* (1903–1904). I am under great obligations to Winckler, but have not found it necessary to commit myself to the guidance of Hommel, from whose *Ancient Hebrew Tradition* I only gathered the fact of Hommel's substantial agreement with Winckler as to Muṣri. Hommel's later Biblical investigations ("Vier neue Arabische Landschaftsnamen," in his *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*, vol. ii., 1900) crossed my own. The views of both scholars were controverted by König (*Fünf neue Arabische Landschaftsnamen im A.T.*, 1902). For Winckler's views see also his *Muṣri, Meluhha, Main* in *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiat. Gesellschaft* (1898), and *Geschichte Israels*, vol. ii. (1900).

and Kûs. To me it appears that Winckler, to whom the explanation of these passages is due, has made a discovery of the utmost value for criticism. British scholars have as yet, I am sorry to say, been somewhat shy of accepting or even investigating this, nor have even German critics shown themselves half as willing to examine into things as one could have wished. Never surely was caution more misapplied, and never were the evil consequences of deficiency of resource and undue suspicion of Assyriology more apparent. I do not hesitate to say that Winckler's discovery and his attempt to utilize it for the Old Testament imposes a special duty on the commentator—the pleasing duty of expressing gratitude to him for a flood of light on many Old Testament passages.

The limits of these regions do not concern us to-day, nor would it as yet be possible from the evidence at our command to state them precisely. According to one authority the ethnic name for the people of Muṣri, at any

rate in the time of Esar-haddon and later, was Midian;[1] the region itself, it is said, adjoined the land of the king of Meluhha on the south, and on the north extended to the border of South Palestine.[2] This seems to me, having regard to the Old Testament evidence, to need modification; but the main point for the student is to assimilate the fact that in the N. Arabian border-land were regions called Muṣri and Kûsh, and in reading the Old Testament to bear this fact in mind. The territories referred to were, it appears, under vassal-kings, who paid homage to a far more powerful monarch much more distant from Palestine. One caution must here be given. It would be a fatal mistake to picture to ourselves the region called Muṣri or, in Hebrew, Miṣṣor or Miṣrim, as under the same physical conditions in primitive times which the same region (probably) displays

[1] Winckler (*K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., p. 143). Hommel makes Moṣar (Muṣri) and Midian synonymous (*Vier neue Landsch.-namen*, p. 277).

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 141 *ff.*

to-day. We can hardly venture to doubt that it was, on the whole, more fertile and productive, and that its civilization gave a very tolerable reflexion of the advanced culture both of the flourishing states of S. Arabia and (partly through S. Arabia, partly perhaps through regions nearer to the Euphrates) of Babylonia. I trust no one will be so unfair as to blame me for the inevitable *lacunæ* in my information. The Hebrew texts compel us to assume much that is only imperfectly confirmed from other sources. But as soon as the S. Arabian inscriptions, collected by Glaser, have been thoroughly examined, we may reasonably hope that much fresh light will be shed on ancient Arabian culture, and that this will promote the better comprehension of the Old Testament.

Some knowledge of the names of the regions of the S. border-land, and of their former close connexion with Israel, seems to have been possessed by scribes and editors at a comparatively late period, but afterwards, as

a consequence of still further changes and catastrophes, such knowledge evidently disappeared. Partly through corruption, partly through editorial manipulation, the archaic N. Arabian names became transformed into names belonging to a different geographical area, or, as in some cases, were wrongly vocalized, or at any rate placed in vicinity to names which had become transformed, so that a correct view of the original sense was precluded. And yet it is often possible, sometimes with probability, sometimes with practical certainty, to restore the original names, if we will but give up that prejudice in favour of the uncriticized or superficially criticized Massoretic text, and of the uncriticized or but half-criticized Hebrew text, apparently used by the Septuagint translators, and proceed to apply a methodical criticism to that text (or those texts). I am afraid that, until this course shall have been adopted, the task of a commentator will continue to be rather an unremunerative one. He may

indeed limit himself to discovering the sense put upon the ill-transmitted Hebrew text by the latest editor (a task not as yet consciously attempted), but he will hardly come very near the sense intended by the original writer. Such at least is my own conclusion, after no hasty examination of the subject. In case, however, this should be too bold for the ordinary student or critic, I will now propose a practicable compromise.

Let me begin by mentioning some of the passages in which the least amount of textual criticism seems to yield highly important results.[1] In fact, all that is required in these cases is to assume that Miṣraim (Egypt) or Ṣor (Tyre) has been misread for Miṣrim or Miṣṣor (names of N. Arabian regions), or Miṣri should be interpreted as "a man of Miṣṣor" (*i.e.* a N. Arabian), rather than "a man of Egypt," "an Egyptian." To these I will add some

[1] These agree for the most part with Winckler's list of passages in *Muṣri*, ii., 1898 (cp. *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., pp. 144–148). They are independent of Hommel's results as given in *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*, pp. 304 *ff.*

passages in which the land of Kûsh has been supposed to be the well-known African Kûsh (or Ethiopia), whereas really it is the Arabian Kûsh adjoining Miṣṣor or Miṣrim, which the Biblical writer meant. I plead with students for the general acceptance of at least these results, or most of them, as absolutely necessary, if the critical study of the text and of its meaning is to make progress. I have not attempted to be exhaustive in my list of Miṣrim-passages; elsewhere in this volume (see the Notes) some fresh ones will be found. If anyone is convinced that I am mistaken, I shall be most grateful to him for a really thorough refutation which takes in and accounts for all the critical and exegetical facts much more adequately.

(*a*) In Gen. xvi. 1 we read that Abram's wife Sarai had a Miṣrite hand-maid whose name was Hagar. The lexicons and commentaries tell us that "Miṣrite" here means "Egyptian," and yet with singular inconsistency they derive "Hagar," not from any Egyptian word, but

from the Arabic. Some of them too very honestly mention that the ethnic name "Hagrim" (in our Bible "Hagarenes" and "Hagarites") reminds us of "Hagar." The case is exactly parallel to that of 1 Chr. ii. 34, where we are told of a certain Jerahmeelite that he had a Miṣrite slave called Jarḥa (Yarḥa). It is plain that Jarḥa is a corruption of Jeraḥmeel (Yeraḥmeel), and yet the commentaries go on saying that the slave referred to was an Egyptian. So far as I can see, it is quite certain that both Hagar and Jarḥa were, according to the narrators, N. Arabians. Of course, too, in Gen. xxi. 21 the narrator meant to say that Hagar fetched Ishmael a wife "out of the land of Miṣrim" (not Miṣraim). There is no evidence whatever that Ishmaelites were ever regarded as partly of Egyptian origin.

But, it will be asked, did not Abram go down into Egypt, and there receive from the Pharaoh a gift of men-servants and handmaids? Is not this fact subversive of the theory? This requires us to consider (*b*) Gen.

xii. 10–20 so far as is necessary to refute the objection. My reply is that there is nothing in the narrative as it stands which can with any positiveness be called distinctively Egyptian colouring. "Pharaoh" may have been produced out of Pir'u (attested as a Miṣrite name). Between "may" and "must" there is doubtless a difference, but we have a right to prefer the alternative which enables us to account for the mention of camels, which could not be Egyptian at all, unless brought by traders from elsewhere—a sufficiently violent supposition. And to this I add that in the two parallel versions of the same popular story (chap. xx. and xxvi. 6–11) the scene is certainly laid in the S. of Palestine, and that in xx. 4, 6 (cp. 1 Sam. xxx. 15) the offending king is a worshipper of Adonai or Elohim. The original writer therefore cannot have meant to tell us that Abram "went down into Egypt." This must suffice to-day on this interesting subject; more perhaps may be said on another occasion.

(*c*) Turn, next, to 1 Sam. xxx. 13. There

are few things more impossible than the sentence, "I am a young man of Egypt, slave of an Amalekite." Observe that the language causes this person no difficulty, that he is well acquainted with the country, and is a worshipper of Elohim (*v.* 15; cp. Gen. xx. 6). Obviously the young man was a Miṣrite of N. Arabia. It can be shown to be highly probable that the N. Arabians here referred to had a religion akin in externals to the popular religion of their Israelitish neighbours.

(*d*) The story of Benaiah (2 Sam. xxiii. 20*f.*) has puzzled all the critics, simply because they had not the right key to the difficulties. Not to mention more than one of these difficulties, surely the improbability of the sudden jump from Moab to Egypt is not easily to be explained away. "He slew the two (sons of) Ariel of Moab, . . . and he slew an Egyptian, a goodly man," as the Revised Version gives it, is a most improbable sentence—more so even than that just mentioned in 1 Sam. xxx. 13. If the first part is corrupt (which few, I

think, will deny), surely we may well suspect something wrong in the second. Apart from prejudice, must it not be plain that "a Miṣrite" here means, not "an Egyptian," but "a N. Arabian," and this could easily be proved, if I had time to refer to parallels elsewhere for the absolutely certain correction of "a goodly man," or rather "a man of countenance, or sight" (Authorized Version, margin). Do you ask what this necessary correction is? It is "îsh jeraḥmeel" instead of "îsh mar'eh." Thus we get, "And he slew a Miṣrite, a man of Jerahmeel."[1]

(*e*) That Solomon married the daughter of an Egyptian king (1 K. iii. 1, vii. 8, ix. 16, xi. 1), is to say the least improbable. Miṣrim, not Miṣraim, is the country with which Solomon was most naturally connected.[2] To this an acute and learned scholar has added that in the Tel el-Amarna letters it is expressly said,

[1] See *Critica Biblica* on the passage.

[2] Cheyne, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, July 1899, pp. 559 *f.*; *Enc. Biblica*, "Solomon," § 5*a*. König does not refute this.

"Never has a daughter of the king of Egypt been given as a wife to anyone" (*i.e.* to a foreign prince), and that in this case such a matrimonial alliance was specially improbable, Solomon being a vassal king.[1] This view, however, needs to be supported by a keener criticism of the early narratives in Kings than the able scholar referred to has given.[2] "Pharaoh," it should be added, need not be due to an interpolation; Pir'u is the name of a king of Muṣri in the time of Sargon, and a late editor, under a complete misapprehension as to the early history, may have read the letter Hé instead of Waw.

(*f*) In 1 Kings iv. 30 (v. 10) the wisdom of Solomon is compared (so it is generally held) to "the wisdom of all the children of the east

[1] Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, ii. 263, cp. p. 262, and W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 390.

[2] A contribution to such a criticism was given in *Critica Biblica*, part iv., which, however scanty and concise, yet may be said to contain some of the most essential things, which will unfortunately be sought for in vain even in Prof. Stade's work on 1 and 2 Kings in Prof. Paul Haupt's critical edition of the Hebrew Bible.

country and all the wisdom of Egypt." Now it is true that Egypt had its proverbial literature (including *e.g.* the sayings of Ptah-hotep), but why should the narrator go so far out of his way, when of all Israel's neighbours Edom had the highest reputation for wisdom (cp. Obad. 8, Jer. xlix. 7, Baruch iii. 22 *f.*, and the Book of Job), and when "it is precisely from Egypt that (Israel) appears to have received the least intellectual stimulus"?[1] Moreover, *v.* 31, according to critical principles, is an explanatory gloss on *v.* 30, and in *v.* 31 there is no word which can be tortured into a resemblance to Miṣraim, or to the name of any tribe or population of Miṣraim. On the other hand, the land of Miṣrim (Muṣri), alike from its political importance and its geographical situation, may without difficulty be supposed to have been a centre of S. Semitic sages. It would be easy to pursue this subject further, did time permit.

(*g*) 1 Kings x. 28 *f.* Horses from Egypt? "Is it in the least probable that they ever had

[1] Toy, *Enc. Biblica*, "Wisdom Literature," § 2.

an export-trade in horses, when we consider the lack of extensive pastures in Egypt?"[1] It is true that in the Amarna tablets Egyptian feudatories in Palestine request chariots and horses of the Egyptian king. But no one doubts that the Egyptian kings had horses for their own use, and, under special pressure, could furnish them to their feudatories, and in the same tablets we find other princes offering to supply them to the king. Recent critics, following Winckler, have supposed that it is a N. Syrian and Cilician land called (as if to plague the critics) Muṣri, and famous in antiquity for its horses, that is meant in 1 Kings x. 28 *f.* But to this view there are several objections, notably the fact that, unless 2 Kings vii. 6 be an exception, there is according to the new theory no further reference to a N. Syrian Miṣrim, but abundant reference to a N. Arabian. But 2 Kings vii. 6 is *not* an exception. We are therefore driven back on the supposition that the country meant is the N. Arabian Muṣri. It

[1] *Enc. Biblica,* "Mizraim," § 2*a*.

is true, we have been accustomed to think that the Arabian horse was not known outside Arabia before the Christian era. But if on other grounds there are passages of the Old Testament which refer to the Arabian horse, must we not reconsider our opinion? Provisionally this is all that need be said. There is at any rate no escape from the admission that 1 Kings x. 28 *f.* records Solomon's importation of horses from the N. Arabian land of Muṣri.

(*h*) It is stated in the ordinary text of 1 Kings xi. 18 and 40 that Hadad and Jeroboam both sought refuge in Miṣraim (Egypt). It is much more natural, however, to suppose that they fled to Miṣrim (Muṣri).[1] The king of Muṣri, who had given Solomon a wife, was naturally disposed, out of selfish motives, to play off Hadad and Jeroboam against his ambitious son-in-law.

(*i*) With regard to 2 Kings vii. 6, the nearest

[1] Cheyne, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, July 1899, pp. 551–568. Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, ii., 1900, pp. 269–273, agrees independently on the main point.

allies the Israelites were likely to obtain were the so-called Hittites and the N. Arabian Miṣrites. An old connexion existed between the Israelites and both these populations. David had a "Hittite" among his chief warriors (2 Sam. xi. 3, xxiii. 39), and Solomon was alternately on good terms and on bad with the king of the N. Arabian Miṣrites. The "Hittites" referred to were most probably the neighbours of the N. Arabian Miṣrites. The other view, viz. that the Hittites and Miṣrites were from N. Syria, is less probable, (1) because these northern peoples cannot be shown to be elsewhere referred to, and (2) because of the expression "the king of Israel has *hired* against us." The Arabians were born mercenaries.

(*k*) The alliance referred to in Isa. xxx. 2, xxxi. 1, was probably not with Egypt, but with Muṣri. Even if "Hanes" in *v.* 4 can be plausibly identified,[1] we must still ask why this place (whether this or that Egyptian city be

[1] See, however, *Enc. Biblica*, "Hanes."

meant) should be mentioned at all. At the very least, *vv.* 6 and 7 must refer to a journey to Muṣri,[1] but there seems to be no sufficient reason for stopping short here. Sargon speaks of Pir'u, king of Muṣri, in the very same terms which are used *v.* 7*b* by the prophetic writer.

(*l*) Amos i. 9, as the text stands, contains a threat against Tyre. But "Tyre" between Ashdod and Edom cannot be right. The theory of interpolation would be inadequate, Clearly this is one of the cases in which Ṣōr (Tyre) has been miswritten for Miṣṣor (Muṣri). It would seem, then, that the Miṣrite as well as the Edomite people was regarded as a "brother" of Israel.

(*m*, *n*) Joel iii. 9 and Ps. lx. 9 must be taken together. In the former passage "Egypt" and "Edom" are grouped together, without any apparent reason. In the latter the "strong city" and "Edom" do not pro-

[1] First worked out by Cheyne, *Isaiah*, in Paul Haupt's edition of the Hebrew Bible, p. 102, on the basis of Winckler. See *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., pp. 172 *f.*, and cp. Marti *ad loc.*

duce a parallelism. The remedy is easy. "Egypt" should of course be Miṣrim, and "the strong city" should be "unto Miṣṣor." Thus the lands of Muṣri and of Edom are parallel, just as they are parallel in the misunderstood passage, Am. i. 9.

(*o*) On the passages in which "Shihor" and "Miṣraim" (Egypt) are combined, see Note xv., pp. 268 *f.*

I have to refer next to a few passages in which the N. Arabian Kûsh, which has been found by Winckler in the cuneiform inscriptions, is almost beyond reasonable doubt referred to. Here too, if I am wrong, I hope that some one will do me the favour to refute me, showing how the various facts can be more adequately accounted for.

(*a*) Gen. ii. 13. The mention of Havilah in *v.* 11 makes it extremely probable that the N. Arabian Kûsh is meant.[1] Whether

[1] Winckler agrees with me, but explains Kûsh to mean S. Arabia; the same name, he remarks, as that given to Nubia, from a fantastically wrong geographical conception. But he himself tells us that "Kusi and Meluhha" is the

the geography of the description of Paradise is quite as fantastic as a good authority has supposed,[1] seems to me very doubtful. It may be mentioned here that Hiddekel (see *Enc. Bib.*, *s.v.*) is certainly not the Tigris, and that Perath (Engl. Bible, "Euphrates") is probably the short for Ephrath, which is a southern name (cp. 1 Chr. ii. 19), distorted in Num. xxii. 5 into "Pethor" (for the view here rejected see Dillmann or G. B. Gray on Numbers). This is also the true explanation of Perath in Jer. xiii. 4 *ff.*

(*b*) Gen. x. 6. Kûsh and Miṣrim (not Miṣraim) are both sons of Hām, *i.e.* Jerahmeel. We have now some guidance in explaining the sons of Kûsh and Miṣrim, a subject which I must of course leave untouched at present.

(*c*) Num. xii. 1. Why did Moses marry

usual designation of N. Arabia. The Old Testament passages seem to me to point to N. Arabia, as in the case of Muṣri.

[1] Winckler, *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., pp. 137–144.

an "Ethiopian woman" (so Auth. Vers., after Septuagint)? Why indeed? But the Hebrew has "Kûshite"; a N. Arabian woman is meant, presumably Zippōrah.

(*d*) Judg. ii. 10. "Kushan-rishathaim, king of Aram-naharaim," is a highly problematical personage. "Kushan," however, gives us the key. The original tradition made him a N. Arabian. Cp. on (*p*), and *Critica Biblica* on the passage.

(*e*) 2 S. xviii. 21. It is important historically that David had a Kûshite among his young men, for everything tends to show that David himself sprang from the N. Arabian border-land.

(*f*) Isa. xx. 3. The peoples which Sargon, we are told, will bring to nought are the Miṣrites and the Kûshites. Underneath the troublesome "three years" in *v.* 3 — no one can make the text quite clear — lies the word "Ishmaelites," a gloss on "Miṣrim and Kûsh."

(*g*) Isa. xlii. 3 and xlv. 14. Here again

it is the Miṣrites and the Kûshites of N. Arabia who are meant; a miswritten gloss in the latter passage states that these and the Sabæans are men of Jerahmeel. Where one branch of Jerahmeelites lived, we know from Gen. xxv. 18, 1 S. xv. 7; "Ishmael" and "Amalek" are both synonyms of Jerahmeel.

(*h*) Hab. iii. 7. "Kushan," which is parallel to "Midian," is of course not "Ethiopia" (as the Septuagint), but the N. Arabian Kûsh. Cp. on (*d*).

(*i*) Ps. lxxxvii. 4, a proof-passage both for Miṣṣor and for Kûsh. The right reading is, "Behold Philistia and Miṣṣor, with Kûsh."

(*k*) 2 Chr. xiv. 9. Zerah was surely not an Ethiopian (a view which is very difficult to make plausible), but a N. Arabian Kûshite (see *Enc. Bib.*, "Zerah"). The N. Arabians made periodical raids on Israelitish territory.

(*l*) 2 Chr. xxi. 16. "The spirit of the Philistines and of the Arabians which are beside the Ethiopians" (Revised Version) is

very strange. Plainly the N. Arabian Kûshites are meant.

I make no apology for the length of this examination of passages. It would indeed be hard to exaggerate the importance of the task which I have undertaken. The light-hearted way in which commentators allude to this subject is very much to be regretted. One remark, however unwelcome, or at least troublesome, to those who investigate Hebrew names, I am bound to add, viz. that there are a number of passages in which another N. Arabian double of a well-known name occurs. I do not now refer to those in which a N. Arabian Aram is most probably referred to, because this interpretation of the passages rests at present solely on exegetical necessities and on the inherent probability derived from analogies. The name I refer to is Asshur (see NOTE XV.), in my view of which I am supported by Professor Hommel, who rests his own argument largely on the Minæan inscriptions. I may add that this

name also occurs in the more original form Ashḥur, as well as in various corrupted forms such as Shur and the personal name Sisera (*s* is duplicated, and *a* transposed), while Ashḥur sometimes becomes Shihor, Hur, Geshur, Achish, and very possibly Kûsh. That the southern Asshur does not appear in the cuneiform inscriptions can hardly be thought strange. Kûs at any rate is found, and Kûs or Kûsh, like Achish, possibly comes from and represents Ashḥur (see p. 270).

To form a decided opinion on all the details here referred to, would of course be impossible for ordinary students. But even a slight examination will show that there must be a good deal in these researches, and that it is by no means a rash opinion that the history of Israel was largely affected by Arabian as well as Babylonian influences. That the textual criticism of the Old Testament is passing into a new phase, must be obvious, however troublesome this may be. On some of the details it may be long before

even a fairly good critic can see his way, for mighty is the power of prejudice, and the tendency to minimize unwelcome facts is universal. Still it is not a rash opinion that by utilizing Winckler's discovery scholars who are not afraid to dig down into the two recensions of the Hebrew text[1] may be enabled to restore much of the original text sufficiently for historical purposes. In two recent articles in the *Hibbert Journal*[2] I have endeavoured to show where I myself stand, and to explain my principles to the larger public. I have also in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and in its sequel, *Critica Biblica*, and lastly in my new *Book of Psalms* (1904), shown how these principles work out in practice. If life and health are granted me, I will not only go on correcting my own faults—for who can escape faults?—but also treat some of the new historical and exegetical

[1] The Massoretic or received Hebrew text, and the Septuagintal, *i.e.* the Hebrew text which lies most directly underneath the Septuagint Greek version.

[2] In July and October 1903.

questions that are arising more fully and connectedly. At present I must be content with having borne some part in laying the foundation for the advanced critical work of the future.

The truth must by degrees make its way. It is a fact, which cannot be argued out of existence, that we have recently acquired two new keys to the Old Testament, by which great problems are being brought nearer to a solution. One is furnished by a critical Assyriology, soon, we may hope, to be reinforced from S. Arabia; the other, by a more methodical textual criticism. I invite you to give your interest and sympathy, not only to those who are, if I may with all respect say so, only gently progressive, but to those who are full of a keen enthusiasm for the use of those precious keys. I have shown you one of the chief sources of critical suggestion in a recent Assyriological discovery which has a close bearing on textual criticism. Pardon me if I devote some of the closing

words of my Lecture to this most important subject.

The Hebrew text, as it stands, is a valuable record of what, according to the later scribes and writers, the sacred monuments of their history and religion ought to have been. To those scholars who enable us to understand better what those scribes and editors meant, we owe our gratitude. But equal thanks must surely be due to those who, combining reverence with freedom, and using new methods as well as old, endeavour to reproduce to some extent what the ancient Israelitish writers actually said.

Have I succeeded in making myself fully understood? The strength of educational prejudices may, with some, have hindered this. I will therefore try to explain myself more plainly. There are, as I venture to think, two great works for Old Testament scholars to do in the text. One is to find out, with the help of the versions, what meaning or meanings the last editors of the

Old Testament put upon the text, when that text had already suffered greatly from corruption. The other is to approximate as closely as possible to the true text and to its meaning by looking underneath the received Hebrew text and that presupposed by the Septuagint. These two works ought to be kept quite distinct. To attempt to explain the traditional text on the theory that it is not very seriously corrupt, and that by the comparison of Arabic and Assyrian words, or by grammatical subtleties, the meaning of the original writers can be extracted from it, does not appear to be the most critical course. And the same judgment must be passed on those scholars who, though aware to some extent of the serious corruption of the text, seek to correct it without taking any account of Winckler's discovery of Muṣri and Kûs in the inscriptions, and of the most obvious of the corrections of the Hebrew text which have resulted from this.

At the same time let me once more cordially

admit that much fine work has been done by my old comrades from their own point of view. It is highly desirable to have the tradition put before us with as impressive an array of arguments in its favour as possible. If I may quote words which were deliberately chosen, and which at present I am unable to modify, "well does it (*i.e.* the tradition) deserve the patient and thoughtful study which a succession of modern scholars have given to it, though one may fear that this patient scholarship has sometimes been unconsciously devoted to propping up unsound conclusions."[1]

But will not this new critical doctrine weaken the moral authority of the Old Testament Scriptures? The question implies an inadequate comprehension of the doctrine. For the essence of my teaching is that we have two Old Testaments, one only accessible in

[1] *The Book of Psalms* (1904), by the present writer, Introduction, p. x. The conclusions referred to above are often unsound simply because the tradition is often pure guesswork.

a fragmentary form, the other complete; the one precious to the historian, the other of the utmost value for us all, because it is the authorized expression of the ancient Jewish Church. My views tend to increased conservatism in the rendering of the text of the Jewish Old Testament. As a student I value this text very highly as a record of the attitude of Judaism towards its own past, and as a Christian Churchman too I continue to value highly the traditional form of the Jewish Scriptures. But as a historian of ancient Israel I need something else, and I also think that when the present turmoil has been stilled, those who now speak evil of me, and of all who seek to reconstruct history on a large scale, will become eager to have a share in the fuller development of the new system.

My fellow-Churchmen! I am well aware that your heart is chiefly in the New Testament, but thorough students of the New Testament cannot afford to neglect the Old, or, I would rather say, those who would dig deep into

early Christian antiquity must not ignore either the pre-Christian Jewish religion or the pre-Jewish religion and history of Israel. There is no sharp line of distinction between Jewish and Christian; the Christian religion is a synthesis, and only those who have dim eyes can assert that the intellectual empires of Babylon and Persia have fallen. Babylon in particular has left its mark both on many parts of the Old and on some parts of the New Testament. And yet, the more we recognize the syncretism both of Judaism and of Christianity, the more, if we have any feeling for religion, shall we be conscious of a something which is peculiar to them, and it is for those critics, who like all true Churchmen have a deep sense of religion, but who superadd to this trained historical insight, to make the Church at large understand wherein this peculiarity consists.

NOTES

Note I., to p. 71.

The discouragement given by Prof. Harnack to the study of myths, with a view to illustrate the statement of Christ's Virgin-birth, is to be regretted. But in the interesting note in his *History of Dogma*, already referred to, there is one remark which appears very suggestive, and which is certainly based on a sound intuition. It is that the earliest development of Christian doctrine "is free from heathen myths so far as these had not already been received by wide circles of Jews, . . . which in the case of the idea of the Virgin-birth is not demonstrable." Certainly the "idea" of the Virgin-birth, held, as it appears, by some Jewish Christians, could not be of non-Jewish

mythic origin, unless it had first of all been accepted in Jewish circles. But, as Prof. Gunkel has pointed out, Jewish syncretism began early, and the same scholar sees very clearly that the "idea" must have found acceptance among the Jews, and (to use his own words) have "belonged to the Christological dogma" before the birth of Jesus. Unfortunately he cannot venture to point to any actually extant Jewish story as the original of the Jewish-Christian statement. To me, I confess, this attitude of resignation seems unnecessary, and, as it happens, the Jewish story, which I have myself ventured to single out as probably the required original, has been very ably treated by Prof. Gunkel in another but not remotely separated connexion. That on the most important point we are completely agreed, has already been mentioned. Prof. Harnack's final assertion that "it is in point of method not permissible to stray so far" (as the comparative mythologists seem to him to have done), "when we have near at hand such

a complete explanation as Isaiah vii. 14," would be controverted by Prof. Gunkel as earnestly as it is by me. On this matter, scholars need, I think, to be brought, by persuasive pleading, into a larger measure of agreement. Let me add a few words upon it.

It has been too much overlooked that the mistranslation of *hā-'almah* in the Septuagint of Isaiah vii. 14 is so far from accounting for the belief in the Virgin-birth of Christ that it requires to be explained itself. There is no reason whatever to suppose that the Septuagint translator decided upon the rendering ἡ παρθένος from philological considerations. Jerome may have traced *'almah* to the root *'ālam*, "to hide" (*significat virginem absconditam*), but it is not probable that there was any such tradition among the Septuagint translators, who in four passages render *'almah* by νεᾶνις (as Aq., Symm., and Theod. in Isaiah vii. 14). In Gen. xxiv. 43, the ἡ παρθένος of the Septuagint (for *hā-'almah*) is simply a loose rendering which does not affect the sense, and might quite as well have

been given in Ex. ii. 8. But in Isa. vii. 14 the translator must have had some special motive, and that motive must have been not philological, but, if I may say so, ideological. Baldensperger (*Die messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen*, 1903, p. 200) thinks that Jewish writers may already have begun to reflect upon the religious value of virginity and sexual abstinence. This is not satisfactory; a more concrete explanation is wanting. Nor need we look far for it, if we do not on principle reject the help of comparative mythology. (See p. 82.)

As for the quotation in Matt. i. 22 *f.*, it is perfectly well accounted for as one of the subsidiary Biblical proofs which were habitually sought for by the evangelists. The real supports of their statements were traditions of one kind or another, but their belief in the written word of prophecy led them to look for a justification of these traditions in the prophetic scriptures, and with this amount of justice, that sometimes

the traditions and the prophecies had a common origin.

Another scholar (Dr A. Wright) deserves credit for denying that the statement in Matt. i. 18 has arisen out of a mistranslation. "We cannot allow," he says, "that this error gave rise to the doctrine." He thinks that "in other cases where quotations from the Old Testament are introduced, . . . the quotation is later than the context" (*Synopsis*, Introd., p. xli.). It is at any rate probable that there were current collections of passages from the prophets which were interpreted Messianically, and were used by the evangelists.

Note II., to p. 77.

A. *Babylonian affinities* of the story in Rev. xii.—I hold with Prof. Gunkel that the story referred to has arisen out of an ancient mythologic tradition of a World-Redeemer which had become "international," but was ultimately of Babylonian origin.

Let me illustrate and explain this statement. Prof. Fritz Hommel, in 1890, declared that the dragon in Rev. xii. must be the dragon Tiâmat, and Prof. Hermann Gunkel, in 1895 (in his fine work, *Die Schöpfung und Chaos*), pointed out a number of features in that strange narrative which appeared to him to suggest that it arose out of a Babylonian myth.[1] He could not indeed find exactly such a myth in the Babylonian records as yet brought to light, but that, considering our limited knowledge, cannot be said to be an important objection. That the seven-headed dragon (Rev. xii. 3), also called "the ancient serpent" (ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, *v.* 9, xx. 2), is no other than Tiâmat, whom the god of the springtide sun — Marduk — encountered and overcame, and with whom Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch[2] long ago identified the "seven-headed serpent" of the primitive Babylonians, he had no difficulty in showing. That Tiâmat

[1] *Schöpfung*, pp. 379–398.

[2] *Wo lag das Paradies*, 1881, p. 148.

is imagined as a monster of the watery abyss is in accordance with what we read in *vv.* 15 and 16. She is also said to have had a portion of the newly-produced gods on her side; so in *v.* 7 we hear of "the dragon and his angels." Prof. Gunkel has also pointed out striking points of contact between Rev. xii. and Dan. vii., and argues that since the former passage cannot possibly be viewed as an imitation of the latter,[1] and since Dan. vii. has been proved (by himself) to have strong Babylonian affinities, we cannot do otherwise than assume a Babylonian origin for Rev. xii.

Prof. Gunkel's theory has found an assailant in Bousset, who, besides objecting to two points of detail, thinks the Babylonian origin rather assumed than proved.[2] That is true; but the *ultimate* Babylonian origin remains probable, only we must put it far back in

[1] Gunkel also compares Rev. xii. 4*a* (the dragon's tail drawing the third part of the stars, and casting them to the earth) with Dan. viii. 10 (the little horn casting down some of the stars to the ground).

[2] *Die Offenbarung Johannis,* pp. 408–410.

primitive times. That an old sun-myth has been worked up in Rev. xii. is not denied; on the contrary, Bousset (who is followed by Porter, in Hastings, *Dict. Bible*, "Revelation") also energetically affirms this. Gunkel on his side now definitely asserts that the mythic material of Rev. xii. must have become "international" in a primitive period.[1] This is no doubt a necessary concession, and may now be regarded as practically certain.

B. Has the story *Egyptian affinities*?—Bousset (*Offenb.*, pp. 410 *f.*) shows that it has. "The woman, the mother of the child, becomes the great Mother of the gods—Hathor (or, as she is also represented, Isis);[2] the child is the young sun-god Horus; the dragon is Typhon.[3] [Hathor is represented in Egyptian

[1] *Zum religiösen Verständniss des N.T.*, 1903, p. 55.

[2] The characteristic point in the Isis myth is that this goddess is the mother of Horus; whether or not she was represented as the consort of Osiris, was indifferent (Roscher, *Lex. der Mythologie*, ii. 1, col. 364).

[3] Gunkel (*Verständniss*, p. 57, note 1) remarks that in Egyptian mythology Typhon is described as red (Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, 22, 30; Eus., *Præp. Ev.*, iii. 3).

monuments with a sun on her head; Horus is called the beautiful boy; his birthday is celebrated at the opening of spring. The most favourite symbols for Typhon (Set) are the dragon, the serpent, and the crocodile. In the Gnostic Pistis Sophia the dragon who pursues Sophia has seven heads.] After Osiris has been killed by Set, the woman, who is pursued by Typhon, collects his bones, and in a wonderful way bears her child, the young sun-god. Then she escapes on a skiff of papyrus, passes through the marshes, and places herself in safety on the legendary floating island of Chemmis. According to another variant, she bears the young sun-god Horus there." Brugsch, from whose *Religion und Mythologie der Aegypter* Bousset draws these details, gives a hymn to Osiris which contains the statement, "She makes air with her plumage, and produces wind with her wings," which reminds us of the wings of the great eagle (Rev. xii. 14); the sacred bird of Hathor-Nechbit was the vulture. The same

hymn mentions the victory of Horus over the dragon (see NOTE III., p. 212). Bousset, then, appears to me to have done well to cite the myth of Hathor and Horus. A primitive contact between the early Egyptian race and the Babylonians has been made extremely probable by Hommel. Winckler, too, remarks with justice that the cultus of the Horus-child belongs to the same religion as the Babylonian, and is in this sense Semitic (*Arabisch-Semitisch-Orientalisch*, 1901, p. 127, note 2).

c. Has it *Persian* (*Zoroastrian*) *affinities*?—Recent scholars have come to the conclusion that there were close relations in early times between the Iranian and the Babylonian religions; for this see Oldenberg, in the *Zeitschrift* of the German Oriental Society, 1893, pp. 46–48. This seems to give increased importance to the traces of a Persian story parallel to that which we have to postulate for early Babylonia. There is in fact a Zoroastrian legend of the Virgin-birth of the Saviour, and in the legend referred to the

Virgin appears to have arisen out of a star-goddess; the mythic dragon, however, plays no part in the story. The Saviour is the famous Saoshyant (so the name is given in the Avesta), *i.e.* the Beneficent One, who is to conquer the demons, raise the dead, and ultimately renew the world. This last great act is the close of the protracted world-drama, and may remind us of the Biblical references to new heavens and a new earth (see *Encyclopædia Biblica*, "Zoroastrianism," § 23)—the technical name, often referred to, is *frashō-kereti*. This Saoshyant is represented in a late but important collection of expanded early Zoroastrian traditions, called the Bundahish, as born of a Virgin in a supernatural way to the heroic semi-mythical prophet Zoroaster (Zarathustra, Zaratust). The son of Zoroaster had been wonderfully preserved by an angel, who in due time was to "blend it with a mother" (*Bund.*, xxxii. 8 *f.*). This was the last of the posthumous sons assigned to Zoroaster, or, as one may

say, the last of the Messiahs; for more about him see West's translations from the Zoroastrian Scriptures in the *Sacred Books of the East*, vols. v. and xxiv.[1] Here it is only necessary to mention the grounds of the preceding statement respecting the legend of Saoshyant's virgin-birth. His destined birthplace is said to have borne the significant name "Mountain of the Lord." Can one doubt as to the original meaning of this? Have we not here the counterpart of the mountain of the divine beings, so familiar to us in the Babylonian mythology? In a later tradition, which strikes one as genuinely Iranian, a star is spoken of which descends on the sacred mountain, and contains within itself the form either of a little boy with the appearance of a cross over him, or of a virgin.[2] In either case,

[1] Not only are there scattered notices of Saoshyant and his work in the Avesta, but two passages of the 19th Yasht give more detailed statements. Thus the Bundahish is justified. See Hübschmann, *Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie*, 1879, p. 235.

[2] Böklen, *Die Verwandtschaft*, etc., pp. 97, 100.

the descent of this star from heaven to the earth-mountain (or mountain of the gods) indicates the supernatural birth of the Child-Saviour, and the tradition which connects the star with a virgin is parallel to the description of the woman in heavenly attire in Rev. xii. 1, while the reference to the virgin in the star suggests that the mother of the child was the deity called by the Babylonians Istar, who was very probably [1] connected in early times with the zodiacal sign Spica (= Virgo). In this connexion it is natural to refer to the beautiful story of the Magi guided to Bethlehem by a star (Matt. ii. 1–12). The star of the Magi was in fact probably suggested by the star which symbolized the Saviour's mother (cp. Rev. xii. 1). See one of the eschatological prophecies ascribed to Zoroaster, quoted by Böklen, *Die Verwandtschaft der jüdisch-christlichen mit der Parsischen Eschatologie*, 1902, p. 100.

D. Are there *Greek affinities*?—It has been

[1] See Zimmern, *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., p. 427.

suggested by Dr Rendel Harris (*Homeric Centones*) that *vv.* 1 and 2 reveal the influence of Homer.[1] One would at any rate hardly expect to find this, and more attention is due to a theory of Prof. A. Dieterich (*Abraxas*, 1891, pp. 117 *ff.*), called "not improbable" by Prof. A. Jülicher in *Enc. Biblica*, col. 2011, and adopted by Prof. Otto Pfleiderer (*Das Christusbild des urchristlichen Glaubens*, 1903, pp. 38 *ff.*). The opinion of this scholar is that the story of the dragon pursuing the child in Rev. xii. 3–5 is a recast of the Greek myth (transmitted by Hyginus) of the great dragon Pytho pursuing the pregnant Leto to destroy her, because of a prophecy that the son of Leto would slay him. The wind-god Boreas, we are told, carried Leto to Poseidon, who brought her to Ortygia, and covered the island with the waves of the sea. Not finding Leto, Pytho returned to Parnassus, and Leto's child Apollo was born in perfect safety on

[1] Ἔνθ' ἐφάνη μέγα σῆμα· δράκων ἐπὶ νῶτα δαφοινος, Σμερδαλέος . . . . (*Iliad*, ii. 308 *f.*)

the island, which was raised out of the sea by Poseidon. On the fourth day after his birth, Apollo, the destined avenger, slew the dragon.

Evidently this myth stands in some historical connexion with the description in Rev. xii.; the reference to the prophecy of the fate of Pytho throws much-needed light on the statement in *v.* 4 of the dragon's animosity towards the "woman." It was plausible, therefore, to conjecture that the myth of Leto was known in the circles to which the author of the Johannine Apocalypse belonged. In fact, there are coins from Asia Minor which bear representations of the flying Leto, and if, as Dieterich holds, the author was a Hellenistic Christian of Ephesus, he would naturally hear more talk of Leto and her son than of the serpent.

Still it is not at all certain that Dieterich's view of the authorship of the Apocalypse is correct. This is most probably a composite work, and to assume that Rev. xii. and whatever hangs together with it is of Hellenistic

Ephesian origin, would be extremely hazardous. To trace it directly to a Greek myth, is inconsistent with sound method. It may well be, however, that the Greek myth of Leto is a recast of an Oriental myth, ultimately derived from Babylonia. Robertson Smith suspected that the name Leto came from that of the Arabian goddess Al-Lat (see p. 74, note 2). One would rather, perhaps, connect it with the name of the Babylonian Allatu, who, though best known as queen of the underworld, seems to have been originally a consort of Bel, the god worshipped at Nippur (see Jastrow, *Relig. of Bab. and Ass.*, pp. 104, 587).

To sum up. The affinities between the story of the Messiah's birth in Rev. xii. 1 and various non-Jewish myths prove that a mythic tradition of the birth of a Redeemer had become international. Its origin is Babylonian. See further Gunkel, *Schöpfung*, pp. 283 *ff.*; Bousset, *Die Offenbarung Johannis*, pp. 406 *ff.*; *Enc. Biblica*, "Apocalypse," § 41. For a popularization of the view that the

conception of a divine or miraculous birth of Christ is of Greek origin, see Slade Butler, "The Virgin-Birth," *Nineteenth Century and After*, July 1904, p. 87.

Note III., to p. 78, note 1.

It was very natural for earlier critics to explain what is said of the dragon in various strange apocalyptic descriptions from Zoroastrian sources. It was equally natural for Gunkel, who opened a new line of interpretation for the Apocalypse, to turn the attention of scholars to the dragon-myth of that great teacher of the nations—Babylonia. The truth, however, which is now coming out, is that Babylonian, Egyptian, and Iranian or Persian myths (all of which have to be registered and compared with the statements in the Apocalypse) are all akin, and profoundly affected the world within the sphere of their influence. I have myself long ago traced both the Babylonian and the Egyptian dragon-myth in the

Old Testament, but not until lately in the Apocalypse. Here I confess myself to have been too long dazzled by the overpoweringly strong evidence of Zoroastrian influence in the very peculiar statements of Rev. xx. 1–7, 10, 14 *f.*

Students of to-day have an easier task, though doubtless, until the more prominent teachers of the Bible become converted to modern views, it will still require some strength of mind to resist the temptations to a misplaced "sobriety" and "caution." Caution, of course, is always needful in certain obscure points, but the right of these researches, and some at least of the results, are established. It is well, however, that those who are engaged in them should remember that there was a primæval period before the myths had obtained any consistency. It would be a mistake to suppose that any developed form of the dragon-myth known to us is, strictly speaking, primitive. On this subject Prof. Keane (in the introduction to the English

translation of Bousset's *Antichrist*) has given some suggestions.

The strangeness of the statements in Rev. xx. 1–7, 10, and 14 *f.* can hardly be exaggerated. The story of Gog and Magog in *vv.* 8 and 9 is plainly based on Ezek. xxxviii. 2–xxxix. 16 (cp. also the Ethiopic Enoch, chap. lvi.). But there is, I think, no parallel in the later Jewish literature to the strongly mythical account of the binding of the dragon for a thousand years, and his subsequent release. It must therefore be a relatively early importation from a foreign source, and have not altogether commended itself to Jewish writers in general. Its source is either a Zoroastrian myth (not of course in a written form), or some story which has a common origin with that myth. The Zoroastrian story will be found in the Bundahish. It tells of a fight in the heavenly world (cp. Rev. xii. 7, xix. 11), between Ahura Mazda (Ormazd) and his helpers on the one hand, and Angra Mainyu (Ahriman) and his helpers on the other, ending

with the final breaking of the power of evil; also of the fate of the serpent Azhi Dahâka, whom Frêdûn was unable to kill, but confined in Mount Dimâvand. "When he becomes unfettered," we are told, "Sâm arises, and smites and slays him." It also speaks of the burning of the serpent Gôkîhar in molten metal. Evidently this last tradition is closely connected with the description in Rev. xx. 10. From such a non-Jewish myth, and not from Dan. vii. 11, the writer of that passage appears to me to have drawn. It is true, the beast "terrible and strong exceedingly" (Dan. vii. 7) which at length "was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame" (*v.* 11), is clearly parallel to the dragon of the Apocalypse. There are, however, great difficulties in the way of assuming the dependence of the Apocalyptic writer here or anywhere on Dan. vii.,[1] and the most probable view is that the writers of both works are dependent on some form of the wide-spread Oriental dragon-myth.

[1] Cp. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 358 *ff.*

The statement (Rev. xx. 2) of the millennial binding of Satan,[1] or the dragon (originally two independent figures, but here virtually identical), is another Zoroastrian feature to be noticed. The restraint put upon Satan (for which cp. Test. Levi, 18, Beliar said to be bound by the Messiah) may indeed also be Babylonian, but the millennium is not to be found in any known form of the corresponding Babylonian myth. In the Bundahish, however, the duration of the world is given as 12,000 years, divided into periods of 3000 years. At the end of the last millennium Sôshyans (= Saoshyant) shall appear. Thus the millennial division is characteristically Zoroastrian. The duration of the period of Azhi Dahâka's imprisonment is given in the Bahman Yasht (iii. 55) as 9000 years.[2] A Zoroastrian origin for the millennium may therefore fairly be

[1] The "Satan" is analogous to the Zoroastrian *Drūj*, the spirit of falsehood, and chief of the helpers of Ahriman; almost indeed to Ahriman himself.

[2] Cp. the Talmudic view that the Messianic kingdom will last 1000 (or 2000) years.

suspected (see *Enc. Biblica*, "Millennium," §§ 1, 2, and cp. "Zoroastrianism," § 15).

But has the Egyptian dragon- or serpent-myth no affinities to the Apocalyptic dragon- or serpent-stories? On the contrary. The defeat and final destruction of the gigantic serpent Apôpi (Apap) and his fellows, when chaos gave place to order, and darkness to light, was not final. Day by day the struggle between the serpent and the sun-god is renewed. This is one form of the Egyptian myth.[1] According to another, Horus with his sharp sword blinds the monster, and imprisons him in the underworld; afterwards the dragon is consumed by fire.[2]

But was there no parallel Babylonian myth in circulation? Zimmern mentions none. It is impossible, however, to believe that the myth of Marduk's struggle with Tiâmat was not at length moralized by the Babylonians

[1] Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, p. 76; cp. Maspero, *Dawn of Civilization*, pp. 90 *f.*, 159; *Book of the Dead*, xv., xxxix.

[2] See the Hymn to Osiris quoted by Bousset, *Offenbarung*, p. 411 (cp. p. 500, note 12).

themselves, and that they did not look forward to a golden age, in the "fulness of the times," when the power of evil, represented by the dragon, would be finally broken. Surely this gifted people, which certainly had the conception of periods of the world and recurrent cycles,[1] cannot have failed to develop this idea. Surely too there were many more myths than the cuneiform tablets have as yet presented to us. For the same reason, it is presumed elsewhere (see pp. 195–197) that there was a Babylonian myth of the birth of Marduk, in which the dragon had a part to play, though we cannot as yet point to it.

Note IV., to p. 73.

The subject of this note is, first, the interpretation of "one like a son of man" (Dan. vii. 13), and next, the explanation of "Michael" (Dan. x. 13, 21, xii. 1, Rev. xii. 7). It will be

[1] See *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., pp. 317 *ff.*, 332 *ff.* (Winckler), 383, 392 *f.* (Zimmern).

seen that these two appellations must be treated in combination, and in relation to the new facts of archæology and of Jewish literature. The first passage, Dan. vii. 13 *f.*, runs thus in the Revised Version :—

> I saw in the night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him : his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

I have ventured to say that this passage from the pattern Apocalypse gave a great impulse to the Messianic belief among the Jews, and that the form of the reference to the Messiah (for such a reference I hold that there is) shows that the Messianic idea had already a development behind it. That an impulse was given to Messianism by Dan. vii. 13 *f.*, is too plain to need proving, and that the Messianic idea was not expressed by the Apocalyptist for the first time is shown by the absence of any special explanation of the title,

"one like a son of man"; who the personage so denominated was, the circle of readers of the original Apocalypse of Daniel must have known.

It should be noted here (1) that the phrase in our Bible, "one like unto a son of man," is unnecessarily obscure. In the recent German translation of the Old Testament intended for general use and edited by Prof. Kautzsch the rendering is "one who resembled a man," and this is certainly the meaning. (2) That according to many scholars the personage referred to is not the Messiah, in spite of the fact that this interpretation is already sanctioned by chap. xlvi. of the Book of Enoch, and by 2 Esdras xiii. 3, as well as by the evangelists. The objections raised are—(1) that the personage in vii. 13 is only said to resemble a man, not to be a man, and (2) that the Messiah could hardly have been thus solemnly introduced only to be dismissed again; in fact, in the subsequent deliverance Michael seems to fill the place which one would have expected

to be given to the Messiah. Hence (*a*) some would regard the Being like a son of man (= like a man) as a mere symbol of the people of Israel, for which the explanation of the vision (*vv.* 18, 22, 27) may seem to plead, and others (*b*) as an angel, presumably Michael, the great prince-angel who defends the interests of the people of Israel (Dan. x. 21, xii. 1; cp. Enoch xx. 5). One of those, however, who have suggested the latter view "is inclined to look for a still higher Being, whose name is significantly withheld, like that of the *numen* of Penuel (Gen. xxxii. 29), at the same time a most exalted personal intermediary between God and the world, and a transcendent prototype of the God-pleasing humanity ultimately to be realized in the people of the most High."[1]

It is in favour of the second view,[2] that else-

[1] The scholar referred to is Prof. Julius Grill, from whom Prof. N. Schmidt quotes the description given above (*Enc. Biblica,* col. 4710).

[2] Prof. N. Schmidt, the first exponent of the Michael theory (*Journal of Biblical Literature,* vol. xix., 1900), has pointed this out.

where too in Daniel angels are represented as having the appearance of men (Dan. viii. 15, x. 16, 18; cp. iii. 25, ix. 21, x. 5, xii. 6 *f.*), and certainly, if an angel really is meant in vii. 13, it must be Michael, for both here and in xii. 1 (where Michael is expressly mentioned) the high angel spoken of has the same function, viz. that of delivering the people of Israel.[1] The objection that if Israel is represented by its prince-angel Michael, the hostile nations ought also to be represented by their angelic guardians, is unimportant. The description is evidently influenced by the primitive Babylonian dragon-myth. Michael corresponds to Marduk,[2] and his enemies are naturally represented by the beast "dreadful and terrible and

[1] Having regard to vii. 11, 12, we cannot but suppose that the Being resembling a man (*v.* 13) has come from the slaughter of the beasts.

[2] This has been well shown by Dr Smythe-Palmer (*Bab. Influence on the Bible,* 1897, pp. 101 *f.*), who also maintains that the archangel Michael is "an official manifestation" of Christ "in His relation to the angels." Cp. Bousset, *Der Antichrist* (1895), p. 151. One step further, and we shall get close up to the truth.

strong exceedingly" (vii. 7). To the further objection that the explanation in *vv.* 18, 22, 27, makes no mention of Michael or of any angel, but of the people of the saints (or holy ones), it is a complete answer that the apocalyptic writer cannot be expected to have had more than a faint comprehension of the old mythic tradition. He is, however, in this case, as we shall see presently, near enough to the mark.

The student who weighs the above arguments will, I hope, conclude that the Being resembling a man in Dan. vii. 13 is very probably no other than the prince-angel Michael. I leave it provisionally open whether "angel" is altogether the right title for this exalted personage. Dan. vii. 13 thus becomes parallel in its presuppositions to Rev. xii. 7, where Michael and his angels are said to have fought against the dragon and his angels.

But, it will be asked, why is Michael called, in Dan. vii. 13, "one like a son of man"? To this more than one answer may be given. (1) He may perhaps be called

so because he is one of those heavenly beings (four? or seven?), who mediate between the "Ancient of days" (*i.e.* the everlasting God) and mankind, and who therefore veil their brightness, and appear in a fully recognizable human form. This, however, is not quite satisfactory. The Most High God is also represented as a man, and in Rev. i. 13 we find the Being "like a son of man" (*i.e.* in the Book of Revelation, the Messiah) described partly in terms borrowed from the description of the "Ancient of days" in Dan. vii. 9. In fact, the primitive view of Yahwè undoubtedly was that He was in appearance like a glorified man (Gen. i. 26, where Elohim is certainly = Yahwè). (2) Another answer, not without plausibility, may be given. It has already been offered by Zimmern[1] and Gunkel[2] to account for the phrase "the man" in 2 Esdras xiii. 1, for "the son of man" in the Similitudes of the

[1] *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., pp. 391 *ff.*
[2] *Verständniss*, p. 47, note 2.

(Ethiopic) Book of Enoch, in the Synoptic Gospels, and in Acts vii. 56, and for "the second man from heaven" (1 Cor. xv. 47, best reading), and, even if not strictly correct, may very likely point in the right direction. The theory is that "man" was the name of one of the Babylonian signs of the zodiac. The four living beings in Ezekiel are most probably derived from the zodiacal signs at the boundary points of the four quarters of the heaven,[1] and which may be respectively—Lion, Eagle, Bull, and Scorpion-man (= Man, in Ezek. i. 10, x. 14, Rev. iv. 7). It is not necessary, however, that the same "man" should be meant in the cryptic terms "son of man" and "man" in the apocalypses and the literature influenced by them, for there were a number of imaginary "men" in the starry heaven of the Babylonians. It is true that we should have expected "bull," the Babylonian prototype of the "being like a man" being Marduk, whose

[1] See Zimmern, *K.A.T.*, pp. 631 *ff.*

sign was the Bull. Was Marduk originally connected with some one of the manlike beings among the zodiacal signs? It may also appear somewhat strange to us that such a vague-sounding expression as "the man" should be the designation of an important personage in the coming close of the present age.[1] But cryptic titles are surely common enough in apocalyptic literature. Moreover, the spell of Babylon was strong. Titles which were no longer understood (as in the supposed case) survived among peoples whose culture was derived from that great metropolis of ancient culture. This theory is not yet fully proved, but is not unlikely to be correct.

The Being resembling a son of man is therefore called so with a deep meaning; he is also, as we have seen, most probably Michael. Besides this, he is (one may with some confidence assert) the Messiah. (1) The most prevalent of the early Jewish interpretations of

[1] N. Schmidt, *Enc. Biblica*, "Son of Man," § 33.

that remarkable phrase is the Messianic. (2) One has a right to expect the subduer of the four beasts in Dan. vii. to be the Messiah or World-Redeemer, because of the strong Babylonian colouring of this chapter as a whole.[1] The identification here proposed accounts, among other things, for the otherwise strange fact that in Rev. xii. 7 the dragon's antagonist is Michael, whereas in xvii. 14 and xix. 11 the successful warrior is the Messiah. The usual explanation is that in the preliminary struggle Michael, and not the Messiah, is the champion of God's cause, because the Messiah is still a child. But this is a later arrangement due to an ingenious speculator; in the original Apocalypse (or in the document on which Rev. xii. is based) Michael probably was the Messiah. And here it is appropriate to refer to the suggestion mentioned above, that the personage introduced in Dan. vii. 13 is a

[1] The four beasts, or living creatures, are suggested by Tiâmat and her helpers; the fourth indeed is the dragon Tiâmat herself. Cp. Gunkel, *Schöpfung*, pp. 323 *ff.*

highly exalted Being, the mediator between God and the world, whose name, like that of the divinity at Penuel,[1] is significantly withheld. For the probability is—though I ask readers to wait for further corroboration of this—that Michael is not the original name of this great Being, but a name which was modified in comparatively later times, and became—to the edification of all pious Jews—Michael, that is, "Who is like God?" To express myself more clearly, I hold it to be as good as certain that Michael is a degraded (but an honourably degraded) deity. And it then becomes very probable that this too is the name referred to in that mysterious passage of the Johannine Apocalypse, "and he hath a name written, which no man knoweth but he himself" (Rev. xix. 12). Into this, however, I cannot now enter; it would involve too great a digression.

Who, then, is the "great prince" Michael,

[1] Gen. xxxii. 29; cp. Judges xiii. 17 *ff.*, and see *Critica Biblica* on the passage. The older criticism is well summed up by G. F. Moore, *Commentary on Judges* (1895).

with whom we have identified both the "Being like a son of man" and the Messiah? He is not a Hebraized form of any one of the Zoroastrian Amesha Spentas[1] (or Amshaspands), the six councillors and helpers of the great God Ahura Mazda (or Ormazd). He might indeed be so, were it not for his connexion with the dragon-myth, which is primarily Babylonian. But the truth is that he corresponds rather to Marduk (Merodach), the son of Ea, and to Nabu (Nebo), the son of Marduk, — originally perhaps identical (Zimmern) — in the genealogical system of

[1] That is, Holy Immortals. Ahura Mazda is often counted with these exalted beings, thus producing seven. This suggests that originally the Amesha Spentas were not personified abstractions but divinities; cp. the seven planetary gods of the Babylonians. That the seven archangels of the Jews and the early Christians (regarded as a form of belief) partly owe their origin to the Zoroastrian system, is probable enough. But this only means that Babylonian influences worked indirectly through Iranian, or, as one may say, a primitive Babylonian myth had become international. See *Enc. Biblica*, "Angel," § 4, note 1, and cp. Zimmern, *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., p. 625.

Babylonian theology. If Michael is not only a warrior but (according to later Jewish writers) the messenger and mediator of the Most High, and an intercessor for man,[1] so also is Marduk.[2] Nabu, too, is represented[3] as a messenger of the gods; he is also the writer-god, by whom the destinies of men

[1] See *Test. xii. Patr.*, Dan 6, "Draw near unto God and unto the angel who prays for you; for he is the mediator between God and man for the peace of Israel"; Levi 5, "And I said to him, I pray, O Lord, tell me thy name . . . And he said, I am the angel who intercedes for the race of Israel, that they may not altogether tread them down." Cp. Judah 25, "And the Lord blessed Levi; the angel of the countenance (blessed) me." In Levi 3 we hear of "the angels of the countenance of the Lord who minister and who supplicate the Lord for all the failings of the righteous." These may be developments of Michael (but cp. Eth. Enoch, xl. 2 *ff.*). See further Lueken, *Michael* (1898), pp. 9–12. This writer goes so far as to say (p. 40) that Michael may even be called the "acting Under-god." In Enoch lxix. 14 *ff.* it is he who is the actual preserver of the world.

[2] "Ea is rarely approached directly. At his side stands his son Marduk, who acts as a mediator" (Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 276). See also especially Zimmern, *op. cit.*, pp. 372 *ff.*; *Vater, Sohn, und Fürsprecher in der Babyl. Gottesvorstellung*, 1896; and Jastrow's review-article, *Journal of American Theology*, i. 468 *ff.*

[3] See Zimmern, *op. cit.*, pp. 400–403, 454.

are written down on the heavenly tablets, which reminds us of the mysterious writer among the seven celestial men, who sets a mark upon those of the inhabitants of Jerusalem who are destined to life[1] (Ezek. ix. 1–4), and of him who was one of the seven (or four) "white ones," and who had a notebook for registering facts concerning the seventy shepherd-angels in (Ethiopic) Enoch lxxix. 61, xc. 14, 22, which reminds us, as one may probably add, of Michael.

According to the Books of Daniel and Revelation and various early Christian documents[2] this great superhuman (and originally divine) personage has the work of subduing the evil principle at the end of the present age. (The Biblical passages already indicated are Dan. [vii. 13], xii. 1, Rev. xii. 7, [xix. 11], and to these we shall presently see reason to add Rev. xx. 1.) But is there

[1] See Gunkel, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, i. 294–300; Zimmern, *op. cit.*, p. 404.

[2] See Lueken, *Michael*, pp. 106–110; cp. p. 27.

no trace remaining of his activity at an earlier period? Surely there must be. It is the theory of the ancient East that history consists of recurrent cycles. The tyranny of the power of evil at the close of this age and its final subduing is but the counterpart of that same tyranny and of its (temporary) overthrow in the beginning of the process of the ages. If Michael, the heavenly Messiah, redeems the world and mankind—especially Israel—in the latter days, he must surely have done so when the powers of evil combined to thwart the powers of good in the primæval times. The Babylonian Redeemer—Marduk—achieved the overthrow of Tiâmat "in the beginning," and though we hear little of his activity at the foundation of the Babylonian people, yet we do know that he was revered as the founder of the sacred cities and temples of Babylonia. And have the Hebrew records nothing parallel to say? Is it not clear from the form of the references to Michael in Daniel that this mighty personage has already

a history behind him? Surely, if we open our eyes, we shall see that the older Scriptures are not silent.

In the first chapter of Genesis the creation of the world is assigned to Elohim, a name which, as no one can doubt, represents Yahwè (misread Jehovah). But in *v.* 26 we are told that Elohim said, "Let us make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness." It is not enough to explain that God is represented as including with Himself His celestial court (1 Kings xxii. 19 *ff.*; Isa. vi. 8; Ps. lxxxix. 5, 6, etc.), and consulting with them, before creating the highest of His works, man,[1] nor that the plural may be that of majesty (a technical term), which is Dillmann's view. It is Yahwè (the Elohim, or Deity, of Israel and *de jure* of the world) who consults with the exalted divine Beings subordinate to Himself, and proposes to them the creation of Man in the

[1] Prof. Driver (*Genesis, ad loc.*) remarks that this is the usual Jewish interpretation, and also that of some Christians, notably Franz Delitzsch.

likeness of the divine Beings. It is co-operation, not mere sympathy, that he demands. Just as in Babylonian myths Marduk has the co-operation of another deity in the making of man, so in the Hebrew narrative, which (like the story in Rev. xii.) is based on a mythic tradition, Yahwè the Creator calls for the co-operation of the subordinate deities, or, may it not be? of a subordinate deity, namely Michael.[1]

Of Michael's activity in the making of Israel, and in the legendary events which preceded it, the Jewish Midrash asserted that it knew a great deal,[2] and I venture to think that there is more in this assertion of the Midrash than our too often dull exegesis is willing to recognize. Of course, however, I only refer to this belief as a curious

[1] The name, as has been already remarked, is probably not the original one. But I must not allow myself to be tempted into side-paths. Suffice it to say that a methodical search in the Old Testament itself has been, as I venture to think, amply rewarded.

[2] See Lueken, *Michael*, pp. 15–19.

coincidence, for what I offer here has its own critical basis, which cannot owe anything to the non-critical wisdom of the Midrash. I would first direct the reader's attention to a phrase which occurs often in the Old Testament, but is specially characteristic of Genesis, Numbers, and Judges, and which has given great trouble to critics; it is that rendered "angel of the Lord" (correctly enough, except that "the Lord" should be "Yahwè"). The phrase "angel of God (Elohim)" also occurs, and means the same thing. The problem is to account for the fact that the "angel of Yahwè" (or "of Elohim") is not a mere messenger of Yahwè, but equivalent to Yahwè or Elohim himself (see especially Gen. xvi. 13, cp. 7; xxii. 1, cp. 11; Ex. iii. 4, cp. 2; xiii. 21, cp. xiv. 19; Judg. vi. 14, cp. 12; xiii. 23, cp. 3, etc.), and yet in some sense is distinguishable from Yahwè (Gen. xvi. 11, xix. 13, 21, 24; Num. xxii. 31). Other passages which have to be considered are Gen. xlviii. 16, "the angel who redeemed (delivered)

me from all evil," where really it is God who is meant; Ex. xxiii. 20–23, "I send an angel before thee . . . my name is in him; . . . if thou obeyest his voice, and doest all that I speak; . . . my angel shall go before thee; . . . and I will destroy them" (cp. xxxii. 34, xxxiii. 2). It may be regarded as in the highest degree probable that in all these passages "messenger" or (in Ex. xxiii. 14, Mal. iii. 1) "my messenger" has been produced by a late editor of the Old Testament out of Michael (*i.e.* "Who is like God"?). It was Michael who, according to tradition, appeared to the personages of the prehistoric period, and especially Michael[1] who delivered Yahwè's people at the Exodus. This exalted Being is the repository of the Name of God (Ex. xxiii. 21); one might surely say that he *is* the Name of God. He is also the Face of God (just as Astart or Ashtoreth is called the

[1] The "captain of Yahwè's host" (Josh. v. 13 *ff.*) is presumably He who was afterwards known as "Michael the chief captain" (Slavonic Enoch, xxii. 6, xxxiii. 10).

Face of Baal); "my Face" in Ex. xxxiii. 14 (cp. 15) means "my angel," or rather "Michael." This gives us the key to the singular phrase "the angel of his Face" in Isa. lxiii. 9. The phrase might mean "the angel who has admission to his presence," and so it was probably understood in later times (Eth. Enoch, xl. 2 *ff.*, and the passages quoted from the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, p. 225, note 1). But this does not give a suitable meaning. The original meaning most probably was "Michael his Face"; "Face" and "Name" are both archaic expressions for "manifestation of God." Similarly in Mal. iii. 1, "my messenger" should most probably be "Michael"; the words "the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in" are, judging from one's experience elsewhere, a scribe's interpolation. Again, in Ecclus. xliii. 26, where the Hebrew text has "angel," it is very possible that the true reading is "Michael." That Michael is the personage who is meant has already been

seen by Prof. N. Schmidt in the *Temple Bible* (*Ecclesiasticus*, p. 170), but my own experience of types of corruption leads me to go further. Nor is this all. In Gen. xxi. 30, where Jacob is said to have called the name of the place Peniel (Penuel), it is difficult not to see one of the titles of this great Being Michael, which was transferred to the sacred spot where he appeared; and the traditional name of the *numen* of Peniel (as I hope to show elsewhere) was either Michael or that older name out of which, as has been said above, the edifying name Michael may have been produced. And lastly, in Rev. xx. 1, where all the commentators have been puzzled at the mention of an angel, we can scarcely doubt that ὁ ἄγγελος is a translation of an already corrupt text of an older Hebrew apocalypse, in which *mal'āk* was written instead of *mīkā'ēl*.

There is much more that might be said to show the need that exists of a more searching criticism, and the sure prospect of an abundant recompense. Many questions as yet unan-

swered are, I am sure, capable of being answered. What, for instance, is the meaning of Belial (Beliar), of Sammael, of Malchira (Ascens. of Isaiah, i. 8)? How came the warlike Messiah to be called in Rev. xix. 13 "the Logos of God"? What made Philo call the Logos ἀρχάγγελος and identify him with the מלאך יהוה? I do not think that Bousset, Lueken, and Charles—thorough scholars as they are—have seen quite all that may already be discerned. And even the least of the problems which centre in the title "the Son of Man" is worthy of the keenest scrutiny.

On the questions connected with the phrase "Son of man," apart from that here raised as to "Michael" (on which it suffices to refer to Lueken's monograph, 1898), see Driver's learned article "Son of Man" in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, and especially the well-arranged and keenly critical article of N. Schmidt in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, where also will be found a full exposition and examination of theories proposed

by other scholars. See also Baldensperger, *Die messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen*; Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, and (when published) *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*; Gunkel, *Das vierte Buch Esra* in Kautzsch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen*; Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*; Bousset, *Religion des Judenthums*, and his lecture, *Die Jüdische Apokalyptik*. In conclusion, note Prof. Bousset's striking words (p. 59 of the Lecture), "In the idea of the Son of Man a pre-existent Christology, as it were, lies hidden. The house is ready. The faith in Jesus only needed to enter it."

Note V., to p. 85.

Fresh evidence is here offered for there being a mythic substratum to Matt. i. 18. I begin (A) with the *Assyrian and Babylonian evidence* (*a*) with regard to the belief in divine generation. In col. 1, line 5, of the Annals of Ashurbanipal the birth of the king is thus

spoken of, "and whom they (the gods Ashur and Sin) formed in the midst of his mother" (*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, ii. 153; cp. *Records of the Past*, first series, i. 57). Similarly it is said with reference to Nebuchadrezzar, in the India House Inscription (col. 1, lines 23 to 25), "when the Lord of lords made me Marduk, he prepared well my birth in the mother (*i.e.* mother's womb)"; see *Keilinschr. Bibl.*, iii. 2, p. 11; *Records of the Past*, first series, v. 113. (*b*) As to the belief in the divine sonship of kings. In a strongly mythological dialogue between Ashurbanipal and the god Nebo it is said, "Small wast thou, O Ashurbanipal, when I committed thee to the goddess, the queen of Nineveh; weak wast thou, O Ashurbanipal, when thou satest upon the lap of the goddess, the queen of Nineveh. Of two of the four breasts," etc. Elsewhere this king appears as a child on the bosom of the mother-goddess, Bêlit-Istar.[1] See also Cheyne,

[1] For both passages see Zimmern, *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., p. 379; cp. A. Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten*

Book of Psalms, 1st ed., on Ps. ii. 7, and cp. his *Origin of the Psalter*, pp. 130, 252.

B. *Egyptian evidence.*—The Egyptian kings, as M. Maspero assures us, were viewed realistically as "blood-relations of the sun-god, some through their father, others through their mother, directly begotten by the god." "Their souls as well as their bodies have a supernatural origin; each soul being a double detached from Horus, the successor of Osiris, and the first to reign alone over Egypt. This divine double is infused into the royal infant at birth, in the same manner as the ordinary double is incarnate in common mortals. . . . It awaked to full self-consciousness in those who ascended the throne at the moment of their accession. From that time to the hour of their death, and beyond it, all that they possessed of ordinary humanity was completely effaced; they were from henceforth only the sons of Ra.

Orients, p. 37. Many representations of Istar suckling a child have been found in the excavations, both at Babylon and elsewhere (Zimmern, p. 429, note 5; Jeremias, p. 37, note 1).

Their complex nature was revealed at the outset in the form and arrangement of their names" (Maspero, *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 259).

This is of special importance as showing how ancient Orientals would naturally understand the phrase "Son of God" as applied to a greater than any historical king. There was a divine element in the human nature of an Egyptian king, but it only became self-conscious at the moment of the king's accession. Another symbolic representation is equally instructive. The Egyptian king was potentially a son of God as soon as born, but actually he became such as soon as he ascended the throne. *We* should most naturally say that the king's accession synchronized with his adoption to be a son of God (cp. Ps. ii. 7,[1]

[1] I fear that the text of this passage is open to criticism (see my *Book of Psalms*, 1904, pp. 6, 7, crit. and exeg. notes). But the received text may represent one of the views current respecting the Messiah in the later period, viz. that he became the "son of God" on his assumption of the regal office. Note the earlier form of Luke iii. 22*b*, referred to at another point, and cp. N. Schmidt, *Enc. Biblica*, "Son of God," § 6.

"Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee"). And this was no doubt one of the ideas current in Egypt on this subject. Hear Maspero again. "From the moment that the Pharaoh became god upon earth, the gods of heaven, his fathers or his brothers, and the goddesses, recognized him as their son, and, according to the ceremonial imposed by custom in such cases, consecrated his adoption by offering him the breast to suck, as they would have done to their own child" (*ibid.*, p. 263).

Still further light on the materialistic theology of Egypt and the East comes from the temple at Luxor, with its very singular sculptures representing the *accouchement* of the mother of Amen-hotep III., and two royal children, who are presented to the great Theban god Amen, nursed by another deity. More commonly noticed by travellers is the representation on the wall of the sanctuary of the great temple of Isis at Philæ, of Ptolemy Philadelphus suckled by the goddess.

The Ptolemies, as successors of the Egyptian kings, assumed such titles as "son of the sun" and "son of Isis and Osiris." The violence done to fact in the representation of Alexander as a son of the god Ammon is referred to elsewhere. So deeply rooted in the East was the belief in the divine origin of kings. The notion of kingly "glory" (*karenô*) in the Zendavesta is also closely connected with the belief in the divinity of kings. All this has a direct bearing on the spread of the imperial cultus in the east of the Roman Empire, which is in veiled language so prominently referred to in the Johannine Apocalypse.

Note VI., to p. 77.

That the grandly attired "woman" is the mother of the Messiah, according to the intention of the Jewish narrator, is clear. It is, however, intelligible enough that such a picture did not please everyone, especially

after the true meaning of the original story had faded away. Of this, the narrative in Matt. i. 18–23 seems to be a proof. Nor is other evidence wanting. Bousset (*Offenbarung*, p. 413) points out that the "virgin" was by some taken to be the Ecclesia (cp. "the virgin-daughter Zion," 2 Kings xix. 31, Lam. ii. 13). See *e.g.* the fourth vision of the *Shepherd of Hermas*, where the Ecclesia appears as a virgin beside the dragon; it should be added that, although the work of a Christian, the *Shepherd* may be taken as a repository of Jewish notions and ideas. Abbott too (*Enc. Bib.*, "Gospels," § 21) refers to a very early letter from the local church of Lyons given by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.*, v. 1, 45), where the "Virgin Mother" signifies the Church. It is noteworthy that Hermas, though he speaks of the dragon, says nothing of the Christ; the conqueror of the dragon, as Bousset remarks, is the virgin. Among other instances of the use of παρθένος, "virgin," for "the Ecclesia," Abbott quotes the statement

of Abercius (about 190 A.D.) that "the pure Virgin grasped the Fish" (*i.e.* Christ), and a passage in the Epistle to Diognetus (*ad fin.*), οὐδε Εὖα φθείρεται ἀλλὰ παρθένος πιστεύεται.

Naturally, too, the conception of the Virgin-mother of Christ as a purely superhuman being found a home in a heretical sect, such as that which Epiphanius (*Hær.*, 79) denounces, and whose priestesses, he tells us, offered cakes to the Virgin, whence their name Collyridians (from κολλυρίς, a cake). Here we cannot fail to discern the fusion of the Mother of Christ with some form of the Asiatic Mother-goddess. For obviously the cakes spoken of are precisely analogous to the cakes offered both in Babylonia and (see Jer. vii. 18) in Judah to the "Queen of Heaven." Later on, however, the leading Church authorities seem to have considered that the conception of Mary as being in one aspect superhuman, embodied in Rev. xii. 1, had a claim to some distinct recognition.

The data of the Apocalypse and of the First Gospel were therefore combined, and a new conception of Mary became widely prevalent. Lovers of Christian art will at once realize this, and will recall the pictures of the Madonna di Misericordia and those old mosaics and paintings in which the Virgin (how unlike the *mater speciosa* of Jacopone's hymn!) is placed beside Christ, on an equality with Him, and often in an attitude of deprecation.[1] In this position of gracious patroness and protectress the glorified Virgin is not without a slight but real resemblance to the idealized goddess Istar, who was perhaps originally conceived of as a virgin.[2] For must we not be fair even to the heathen? And who could wish to speak lightly of the "compassionate mother of men,"[3] upon whom were poured out by the Babylonians such treasures of love and gratitude? It is also surely not

[1] Mrs Jameson, *Legends of the Madonna.*

[2] See Zimmern, *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., ii. 424, 432, cp. 429.

[3] Cp. Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures on Babylonian Religion* (1887); Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (1898).

out of place to recall that Eshmunazar, king of Sidon, built a temple to Astart (Ashtoreth) as the "name of Baal," *i.e.* probably as manifesting the softer and more gracious aspect of the divine nature. As Dr Paton very truly remarks, "Astart of Canaan has the closest affinity with the goddess Istar of Babylonia."[1]

Note VII., to p. 91.

That Luke i. 34 *f.* is a later insertion, is shown with much probability by Prof. Schmiedel, in the course of his elaborate treatment of the position of the New Testament writers, *Enc. Biblica*, "Mary, Mother of Jesus," cols. 2952 – 2969; cp. Usener, "Nativity," § 16, col. 3349. Prof. Gunkel, however (*Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständniss des N.T.*, pp. 67 *f.*), denies that Luke i. 34 *f.* interrupts the context. "Turn the words back into Hebrew, and they give a good connexion." Gunkel also remarks that the nar-

[1] *Syria and Palestine* (1902), p. 51.

rator in Luke i. does not mention the conception of Mary, perhaps because he reverently conceals the special miracle in the birth of Jesus. This scholar's arguments, however, seem less convincing than those of Schmiedel. Dr A. Wright (*Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, 2nd ed., 1903, Introd., p. xlii.) may also be consulted. He thinks it evident "that the doctrine (?) of the Virgin-birth was not generally revealed in the early part of the apostolic age."

Note VIII., to p. 92.

The explanation of the story of the Virgin-birth as connected ultimately with the myth of the Queen of Heaven, the Mother of the Conqueror of the mythic dragon, suggests the true origin of the narratives of the Magi and of the massacre of the Innocents. Both, from our present point of view, are, not history, but pious transformations of current mythic stories. Prof. Dieterich (*Zeitschrift für die*

Neutestamentl. Wissenschaft, iii. 1 *ff.*) takes a different line. He supposes that there is a historical substratum to the popular story of the journey of the Magi in Matt. ii. 1–12, viz. the journey of the Armenian king Tiridates to Rome, accompanied by Magi, in the time of the emperor Nero. Tiridates, himself a Magian, is said to have initiated Nero into the "magic repasts" (*i.e.* the Mithraic mysteries), and bending his knee, and lifting his hands, called him Lord (δεσπότης), and worshipped him (Plin., *Hist. Nat.*, xxx. 16; Dio Cassius, xxxii. 1 *f.*, cp. xliii. 5). Usener (*Enc. Biblica*, "Nativity," § 18) accepts this theory, which Pfleiderer (*Das Christusbild*, p. 101, note 1) also finds "attractive." Usener also thinks that "tidings of the Neronic persecutions spread from Rome may have had their share in bringing about the introduction of the picture of a bloodthirsty tyrant into the story of the Childhood." He adds that "a massacre of innocents, and, as the motive for it, alarm at the threatened advent of a new

ruler, were already current material for legend, as is shown by the romantic story of Marathus concerning the birth of Augustus (Suetonius, *Aug.*, 94)." I do not know whether any of the conservative theological reviewers of the *Encyclopædia Biblica* have brought arguments against these theories. My own objections arise from a difference of method. With Gunkel, I am of opinion that in accounting for popular Messianic stories we ought, in the first instance, to try a mythological solution, which is less likely to be wrong than a solution suggested by some apparent resemblance of reported historical facts. I refrain, therefore, from supposing a connexion between the story of the Magi and the reported journey of Tiridates. The offering of worship or homage by wise men from the East (the home of "wisdom," 1 Kings v. 30) to the wise God (cp. the wise God Marduk among the Babylonians), manifested as a human child, was a necessary part of the pre-Christian "international" myth of the Redeemer to which I have

referred, that "in all things he himself might have the pre-eminence." Similarly, too, the important detail of the guiding star (cp. *Enc. Biblica*, "Stars," § 5) is not to be connected, as by Soltau (*The Birth of Jesus Christ*, p. 38), with portents seen in the skies on the birth of Augustus, the future "lord of the world" (Suetonius, *Aug.*, 94), much less with Num. xxiv. 17, but with a form of the Birth-story which spoke of the Mother of Christ as a supernatural Being who had a mystic connexion with the stars (Rev. xii. 1), or with some special star (see the reference at the end of section C, in NOTE II.).

With regard to the story of the massacre of the Innocents—historically a most improbable tradition, however religiously edifying in the hands of preachers and poets—all that we can grant to the non-mythologists is that tidings of the Neronian persecution may perhaps have increased the interest of some of the Christians in that story. The cruel king Herod may in fact have seemed an anticipa-

tion of the cruel emperor Nero. But is not all this going very much out of our way? Herod's cruelty, exaggerated by popular hatred, became proverbial. It was natural, therefore, that he should be substituted in that pious Haggadah of which I have spoken for the mythic dragon. The massacre itself is clearly analogous to the drowning of the Hebrew children by order of the king of Miṣrim (Ex. i. 22); the careful reader will remember that the king of Miṣrim (*i.e.* the king whoever he may be at any time) is identified by Ezekiel (xxix. 3) with the great dragon of the cosmogonic tradition (see *Enc. Biblica*, "Dragon," §§ 1, 4). There is also a more distant connexion with the mythic ravaging of "cities" and "men" by the monster called *labbu* (lion), *i.e.* Tiâmat the lion-headed. Cp. Zimmern, *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., p. 498; Gunkel, *Schöpfung*, pp. 28, 418; and on the other side, the popular but competent booklet of W. Soltau, translated by M. Canney, *The Birth of Jesus Christ* (London: A. & C. Black, 1903).

NOTE IX., to p. 104.

The plural (fathers), with reference to the mission of the divine hero Hibil-Ziwâ, is surprising. We also find Hibil-Ziwâ spoken of as "his son, who is his brother" (*i.e.* Mandâ d'Hayyês). The two are brothers as belonging to the same category. The elder brothers (*i.e.* the beings of the same category who were called into existence earlier) are reckoned as "fathers" of the younger (Brandt, *Mand. Religion*, p. 139, note 2). Such mythology can hardly have left any trace in the Bible, unless Gunkel is right in finding one in Rev. xii. 17 (see his *Schöpfung*, p. 382). The rule is that Christ is represented as having only adopted brethren, and but one Father, the God of gods, by whom He is sent, not indeed into Hades but into the world of living men (Rev. viii. 31, Gal. iv. 4, John iv. 34, etc.). This agrees with the common Babylonian representation of Marduk as sent by his divine father Ea to help mankind (cp. Zimmern,

K.A.T., 3rd ed., p. 172). There are passages, however, in the Babylonian epic of Creation, (Tablets iii. and iv.) where this same god is spoken of as having the older gods as his fathers. The expression is therefore a genuine part of the mythic story of the Redeemer. It should be noticed that Hibil-Ziwâ corresponds to the god Marduḳ in the Babylonian myth, just as Krûn, the "firstborn king of darkness" in the Mandæan myth, corresponds to Tiâmat in the Babylonian (Brandt, *Mand. Schr.*, p. 150, note 3; cp. Gunkel, *Schöpf.*, p. 364, note 2).

Note X., to p. 101.

The explanation of the sign of the prophet Jonah given in Matt. xii. 40 is wanting in the parallel passage in Luke, where this substitute is given, "For as Jonas became a sign to the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation" (Luke xi. 30). This suggests the most probable transition to Matt. xii. 41,

"The men of Nineveh shall appear as accusers to this generation, and shall prove it guilty."

The "sign" is really the reverse of a sign. How indeed could it be otherwise, when Jesus distinctly refused to work "signs" (cp. Mk. viii. 12)? Nor could the deliverance of Jonah from the sea-monster's belly have been represented by the original writer as a sign to the Ninevites, for neither did they see it, nor, so far as the story goes, were they told of it (see *Enc. Biblica*, "Gospels," § 140 *b*; "Jonah," § 8). It is strange that Wellhausen, in his recent translation of Matthew with notes (1904), should prefer the explanation in Matt. xii. 40 to that in Luke xi. 30. Still as an early Christian statement, quite apart from its setting, the passage here commented upon has its value.

Note XI., to pp. 113, 128.

A. The death of Christ "for our sins" was necessary "according to the Scriptures," says St Paul (1 Cor. xv. 3; cp. *v.* 4 and Matt.

xxvi. 54 and 56). Here there may be a reference to some widely received writings, not in our Canon. In 2 Esdras vii. 29 the death of "my son, the Christ" is spoken of; the context gives no reason for supposing a Christian interpolation. Some earlier work may have contained a similar statement. At any rate we are safe in supposing that St Paul had in his mind Isa. liii. 5, 7, 9, and Zech. xii. 10, the original meaning of which passages does not concern us here. But he would hardly have given such an interpretation to these passages, if there had not been some widely, though not universally, current belief on the subject of the death of the world's Redeemer, and this belief is most easily accounted for as the outcome of a semi-mythic Oriental tradition. That the death of the solar deity Marduk was spoken of, and his grave shown, in Babylonia, is an ascertained fact (Zimmern, *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., p. 371); the death of Osiris and of other gods was an Egyptian belief (Maspero, *Dawn of Civilization*), and, though a more distant

parallel, one may here refer also to the empty grave of Zeus pointed out in Crete.

B. The Scriptures referring to the Resurrection may well have included Hos. vi. 2, itself too perhaps influenced phraseologically by a floating mythic story. But surely St Paul also had in his mind some later Jewish writing which referred to the resurrection of the Messiah. Jonah i. 17 would certainly not justify St Paul's expression, "on the third day."

Note XII., to p. 140.

The Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus now printed amounts to about two-thirds of the whole book. We must not, however, exaggerate the boon, for the problems of the text will occupy scholars for generations to come. I may remark here that caution should be used in arguing from the apparent parallelisms between passages of Ecclesiasticus and passages in our Psalms. For instance, the

parallelism between Ecclus. xxxvi. 6 *f.* and Ps. lxxiv. 10 *f.*, 13, might be held to exclude a Maccabean date for Ps. lxxiv. But, as Prof. N. Schmidt has pointed out (*Ecclesiasticus* in the *Temple Bible*, Introd., p. xxvi.), Ecclus. xxxvi. 1–17 is manifestly an interpolation, which "voices the feelings of a people sorely oppressed by a foreign enemy." Dr Schmidt supposes the Syrian oppression to be that referred to. Israel Levy however remarks that though one might for a little while suppose the prayer to be of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, the reference may be to any other critical period of Jewish history (*L'Ecclésiastique*, ii. 169). Such arguments as that here referred to are of secondary importance. On Ps. lxxiv. see my *Book of Psalms* (1904), i. 326 *ff.*

Note XIII., to p. 145.

It is only a brief sketch of Prof. Winckler's views upon the prophets that can be given

here. So much, however, must be given because this scholar has at his command a large number of new Assyriological facts, and even if his explanation of the facts be inadequate, it must not be ignored. For my own part, I think that, owing to that deficient interest in religion of which I have spoken, Prof. Winckler practically leaves out of sight a number of old but important facts, contained in at any rate the most representative Hebrew prophecies. He is of opinion that the priests of the sanctuary on Mount Sinai, where a god called Jahu (Yahu) was worshipped, had, like priests at other sanctuaries, speculated on the divine nature, and developed a high doctrine of the divine Lord of all life, whom, by a modification of Jahu, they called Jahwè (Yahwè). This doctrine was accepted by the neighbouring clans, whom David had formed into the tribe and kingdom of Judah, and was imposed by this successful adventurer—a native of the southern border-land—upon the older tribes of Israel whom he conquered,

as the national religion. The same refined religious view was held by the prophets, —*nebi'im*, *i.e.* "announcers,"—a class of men known in Assyria as well as in the land of Israel. These "were clear-sighted, educated men, who were superior to the people," and whose action was partly at any rate political. They were not always on the same side. When the kings oppressed the people, the prophets opposed them, and when the priests became the ruling class, dictating the policy of the king, and in their own interest encouraged Baal-worship and fleeced the people, the prophets were against the priests. One of them (Amos) even became a political agitator, for he adopted the political idea of a restored kingdom of David (the pan-Israelite idea), and advocated it in Northern Israel, while at a later time, as Winckler reads history, Jeremiah became a decided adherent of the Chaldean party.

All this is far from satisfactory to those who live in intellectual intercourse with the great

Hebrew prophets. We will not deny the possibility that the development of the higher conception of Yahwè may owe much to priests of whose activity no record has remained, and we must heartily agree that this higher conception was taken up by the Israelitish prophets—in fact, such a theory best accounts for a considerable number of exegetical facts. But when we look into the evidence offered by Winckler for the existence of Assyrian "prophets," we find that the "prophecy" quoted (by Peiser the Assyriologist) expresses the utmost servility towards the king, upon whom evidently his future depends. In fact, the speaker of the prophecy appears to be—as König well points out[1]—just such a prophet as those described in 1 Kings xxii. 6, who said to Ahab (doubtless for a fee), "Go up, for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king." From

[1] *Die Babel-Bibel-Frage und die wissenschaftliche Methode* (1904), p. 17. König also gives the prophecy in full from Peiser, *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft* (1898), p. 257.

such prophets Isaiah (xxviii. 7), Micah (iii. 5, 11), and Jeremiah (xxiii. 14 *ff.*, xxviii. 1 *ff.*, xxix. 8) distinguish themselves with no hesitating voice. Amos, too, expressly tells us that he was no professional prophet (vii. 14).

To the objection that in his earlier statements he represented the greater Hebrew prophets too much as mere men of their age, Winckler now replies that from the point of view of secular history even an Isaiah is and must be a man of his age. "History has to explain the man from his age, and not from his significance for eternity." But should not a historian confess that there are phenomena in some lives which simply by the study of historical circumstances he is powerless to explain? If Winckler had admitted this, his attempted explanation would perhaps have had more force. The greater prophets of Israel were neither mere thinkers who sought to popularize their religious theory, nor political agitators or pamphleteers, nor even

popular tribunes; they were enthusiasts filled with a passion for Yahwè.[1]

For Winckler's views, see passages in his monograph on Ancient Western Asia in Helmolt's *Weltgeschichte*, vol. iii. (1901), pp. 204–206, 210–212, and in his *Geschichte Israels*, vol. i., pp. 37–42, supplemented by *Abraham als Babylonier*, *Joseph als Aegypter*, pp. 35–38. It may be mentioned that Kohler and Peiser in their joint work, *Hammurabi's Gesetze*, i. (1904), p. 142, take a view which most will consider sounder than that of Winckler.

Note XIV., to p. 148.

Can the name Amraphel really come from Hammurabi in spite of the troublesome final *(e)l*? Prof. Hommel (*Die altorientalischen Denkmäler und das A.T.*, 1893, p. 59) still thinks this possible. He holds that the Hebrew writer used a cuneiform record, in

[1] See "Babylon and the Bible," *Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1903, pp. 65 *ff.* (section on Winckler).

which the form of the name was Ammu-DAGAL, *i.e.* Ammu-raḥbi (explained "the Uncle is my breadth"), and that the translator, instead of *raḥab*, took the synonym *raphal*, and all the more readily because there was a Hebrew personal name ραφαλ (Sept., 1 Chr. iii. 21; var. ραφαια). It so happens that both Rephael, the form which cod. B of the Sept. of 1 Chr. *l.c.* seems to presuppose, equally with Rephaiah (the Massoretic reading), are expansions of the ethnic designation Rapha (whence the well-known Rephaim). This may put the well-informed reader on a better track than Prof. Hommel's. Cp. *Critica Biblica* on 2 K. xv. 19 (Pul, king of Asshur). In the text of the Lecture sufficient reason, I hope, has been given for urging at any rate suspense of judgment relative to the historical character of the Chedorlaomer episode, and for hesitating to follow M. Loisy, when he says that, "in spite of some critics, this episode is a sufficiently good certificate of personal existence for the Father of the Faithful" (*Études*

bibliques, 3rd ed., 1903, p. 176). I may here quote from Dr Driver (*Genesis*, Introd., pp. xlix. *f.*): "They (the monuments) thus fall far short of demonstrating its historical character; and still less do they demonstrate that the *rôle* attributed to Abraham in the same chapter is historical." I am of course only concerned here with the bearing of archæological facts, which some have wrongly supposed to prove the historical character of Gen. xiv., and which even M. Loisy, so keen a New Testament critic, does not seem to have adequately considered.

Note XV., to p. 182.

It is a venial error, and yet a hindrance to progress, that the Authorized Version of the Old Testament generally gives "Assyria," where the Hebrew text has "Asshûr." For "Asshur," as pointed out in the Lecture, has two possible meanings, viz. (1) Assyria (which most probably the latest scribes and editors supposed to be the meaning of the word

everywhere), and (2) a region, sometimes of larger, sometimes of smaller extent, in N. Arabia, adjoining the land of Miṣrim or Muṣri. The first scholar to suggest the second meaning, as possible in some passages, was Hommel,[1] who in these cases identifies the Hebrew Asshûr with the Ashûr mentioned, together with Muṣr, in an Arabian inscription in the Minæan dialect, which, in agreement with Glaser, he refers to the ancient Minæan empire ("before 1000 B.C.," Hommel). Instead, however, of following this scholar, who is hardly critical enough, I have gone my own way in applying Glaser's discovery of a N. Arabian Ashûr to the purposes of Old Testament criticism. It is almost beyond reasonable doubt that not only Asshur but Ashḫur often occurs in passages where a corruption which is not altogether without method conceals it from unpractised eyes. Fortunately,

[1] According to this scholar, the southern Asshur extended from the Wady el-Arîsh to the region of Beersheba and Hebron (*Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, 1897, p. 244).

however, there is still one phrase (1 Chr. ii. 24, iv. 5) in the received text in which Ashḥur still exists; "Ashhur (not Ashur, as the Auth. Version has), the father of Tekoa" are the words. Tekoa here is not very essential; it is important, however, that the Septuagint preserves traces of another reading, "Caleb went in to Ephratah, wife of Hezron his father, and she bore him Ashḥur." Now Caleb and Ephratah are both, most probably, N. Arabian names. In *v.* 19 the same tradition occurs in another form, "Caleb took to him Ephrath, who bore him Ḥûr"; in fact Ḥur, like the Egpytian form Ḥaru (p. 153, note 6), is a mutilated form of Ashḥur.

There are some passages in which the N. Arabian situation of Asshur is too plain to be mistaken. For instance (*a*, *b*) in Genesis xxv. 3, 18. In the former passage "Asshurim" is a son of Dedan. In the latter we read, "And they dwelt from Havilah unto Shûr, which is eastward of Miṣrim (of course not Miṣraim, "Egypt"), in the direction of Asshûr." The

most various conjectures have been hazarded to account for the troublesome Asshur; but now we can venture to say that the riddle is solved. Shûr too is doubtless a mutilated form of the same name.[1] Cp. Gen. xvi. 61, xx. 1, and other passages.

(*c*) Gen. ii. 14, "Hiddekel; that is it which goeth towards the east of Assyria." So at least Auth. Version renders, but the Hebrew has "Asshûr." The mention of Havilah in *v.* 11 points to Arabia. All the rest can be harmonized with this. The theory that Hiddekel is the Tigris is by no means proved.[2] Its plausibility depends upon the identification of "Perâth" in *v.* 15 with the Euphrates. But, as we have seen above, Ephrath and Asshur naturally go together. It is very possible that Perâth or Ephrath is first the name of a district and then of a stream in N. Arabia.

[1] Most have seen that the closing words of Gen. xxv. 18*a* are a gloss. But the gloss has not been understood. Shûr is the short for Asshûr (cp. Ḥûr the short for Ashḥûr), and Asshur is in N. Arabia.

[2] See *Enc. Biblica*, "Hiddekel" (Johns).

(*d*) Num. xxiv. 22. The mention of "Asshur" with "Kain" (the Kenites) points to N. Arabia. The larger Asshur was a conquering power, and in so far resembled Assyria. *V.* 24 is a riddle, but most riddles are solved by patience.

(*e*) 2 Sam. ii. 9. But for the mention of "Gilead" no one would doubt that "the Ashurites" meant the people called in Gen. xxv. 3 "Asshurim." There is a riddle awaiting solution—a test of the methods of the "established" criticism.[1]

(*f*) Isa. xix. 23–25. Egypt, Assyria, and Canaan do not form a natural triad, nor is it enough to explain the opening clause of *v.* 23 by the remark of Delitzsch that "the road of communication between these (Egypt and Assyria) passes through Canaan." To Miṣrim, Asshur, and Canaan, however, no exception can be taken.

[1] I may refer to *Critica Biblica* on this passage; for the prevalent view see H. P. Smith, in the International Commentary Series.

(*g*) Ezek. xxiii. 5, 7, 9, 12, 23; the benê Asshur here are most naturally regarded as a N. Arabian people. The religious influence of N. Arabia is likely to have been stronger and more persistent than that of Assyria. It is true, Babylonian influence, direct and indirect, must have been powerful, especially in the department of mythology. But as the text of Ezek. xxiii. stands, Babylonia is, oddly enough, less prominent in the prophetic indictment than Assyria. Still stranger is the language in which the Babylonians are introduced. Is it really credible that "the acquaintance of Judah with the Chaldæans came to pass through pictorial representations, frescoes with pictures of Chaldæan warriors which had been imported from Babylon, and stirred up in the Judæans the wish to form personal relations with those who were thus represented"? Yet this is how the most thorough recent commentator (Krätzschmar) sets forth Ezekiel's meaning.

(*h*) Ezekiel xxvii. 23. One of the most

learned of liberal-conservative scholars (Eduard König) insists very strongly that a N. Arabian Asshur or Ashur cannot be meant here, and praises Hommel for not having used this as one of his proof-passages.[1] "Chilmad," he remarks, "should be 'all Media,'" following Bertholet and other scholars. Evidently this friend (*pro tempore*) of Hommel has overlooked the extreme improbability of such a sequence as "Sheba, Asshur, Media," and the fact that the Septuagint has not Chilmad but Charman (χαρμαν), which is most naturally explained as a corruption of Raḥman, *i.e.* Jeraḥmeel (cp. Num. xiii. 22, "Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmai," names produced by popular corruption from Jerahmeel, Asshur, Ishmael).

(*i*) 1 Chr. xiii. 5, Auth. Version, "Shihor of Egypt"; Rev. Version, "Shihor (the brook) of Egypt." Cp. Josh. xii. 3, "Shihor which is before Egypt." The common supposition is that the writers of these passages gave an ideal-

[1] König, *Fünf neue arabische Landschaftsnamen im Alten Testament* (1902), p. 16, note 4.

istic extension to the S.W. frontier of Canaan. To this and all other theories which presuppose the general or even universal correctness of the vocalization Miṣraim, there are cogent objections.[1] Hommel, however, changed the position of the question by showing that there was a southern Asshur (or Ashur). We can now easily believe that the *naḥal* or wady of Miṣrim (*i.e.* of the Arabian Muṣri) was also at an early period called the wady of Asshur, of rather Ashḥur, and either then or at a later time, by a popular corruption, called the wady Shiḥor. Shiḥor, in a word, is a modification of Ashḥur.

Another corruption of Asshur or Ashḥur is most probably Geshur (Hommel wrongly, Gê-Shûr, "valley of Shur"). There are also well-attested mutilations of the two names, viz. Shûr (see above) and Ḥûr respectively. Ḥûr has, no doubt, often been thought to be a Hebraized form of the Egyptian Hor (Horus). It is, however, really of N. Arabian

[1] See *Enc. Biblica,* "Shihor of Egypt."

affinities, as a study of the passages where the name occurs (see especially Num. xxxi. 8, Josh. xiii. 21) will show. We may compare the name Turi-Aa, which occurs on the cuneiform contract tablet lately found at Gezer. Here Turi is almost certainly the short for Situri, *i.e.* Ashtar (cp. Johns, *Palestine Exploration Fund Statement*, July 1904, p. 239). The same tablet also gives us Ḥuruasi, the first part of which is, according to Hebrew analogies, the short for Ashḥur. Mr Johns suggests a possible Semitic divine name Ḥur, which, however, at the present stage of our inquiry seems unnecessary.

For completeness' sake it may be added that Achîsh (the name of a "Philistine" king) probably comes from Ashḥur, and that this suggests a very possible origin for Kûsh (the name of a N. Arabian region bordering on the Israelite territory). "Sisera," as has been pointed out by me elsewhere, also probably comes from Asshur. Here I must pause. Let no one disparage such inquiries. These

names are not mere dry stubble. They symbolize facts of pre-historic as well as historic Palestine in which no student can fail to be interested. When a new edition of Dr G. B. Gray's instructive work on Hebrew Proper Names (London: A. & C. Black) becomes necessary, such a treatment as that of which I have here given a very inadequate idea, when extended to other analogous names in Semitic inscriptions, will give many new and valuable results, and require many current theories to be sometimes considerably qualified, sometimes altogether abandoned. If to go forward is arduous, to stand still is fatal to the best interests of study.

PRINTED BY NEILL AND CO., LTD., EDINBURGH.

Date Due

MAY 2 - '52

MAY - 2 - '55

Subjects

1. Bible. Historical & literary criticism.
2. Virgin birth of Jesus.

BS511 .C533
Bible problems and the new material for
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00029 0736